

**SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
RECORD OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

No.	DATE RECEIVED	CONSULTEE CONTACT DETAILS	POLICY/ PLAN REF.	CONSULTEE COMMENTS	DRAFT RESPONSE
1	08/11/2018	Resident	Annex Index to map M-BNE 2.3 Page 49	<p>Well balanced report for which we residents must thank the planning group. I know it has not been easy and the group - both as constructed today and those members who have not been able to continue - have contributed to an interesting debate.</p> <p>Priority species. Add Common Pipistrelle. Delete Small Tortoiseshell.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>The Common Pipistrelle is not a Priority 41 species; however, the Small Tortoiseshell has been removed from the list as you suggest.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
2	08/11/2018	Gaynor Gallacher South West Operations – Assistant Planning Manager	N/A	Thank you for providing Highways England with the opportunity to comment on the pre-submission draft of the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan. Highways England is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network (SRN) which in this instance comprises the A35 which passes some distance to north of the proposed plan area, and includes the junction with the A354 Weymouth Road.	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>We are pleased to note that our proposed policies align with your support for non-car</p>

		<p>(Highways Development Management) Highways England, Ash House, Falcon Road, Sowton Ind. Estate Exeter EX2 7LB Tel: +44 (0) 300 4704376 Gaynor.Gallacher@highwaysengland.co.uk</p> <p>Statutory Consultee</p>		<p>We are satisfied that the plan's proposed policies are unlikely to result in development which will adversely impact on the SRN and we therefore have no specific comments to make. However, in general terms we are supportive of policies which improve provision for non-car travel modes and reduce the need for private car trips.</p> <p>However, this does not prejudice any future responses Highways England may make on site specific applications as they come forward through the planning process, which will be considered by us on their merits under the prevailing policy at the time.</p>	<p>travel modes and promotion of a reduction in car usage.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
3	15/11/2018	Resident	N/A	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We read the draft plan with interest and were impressed with the care and attention that was evident in its preparation. It is a thorough piece of work and highlights the issues that are important to the community and reflects the views expressed during consultation. Given the views expressed during the consultation We know that the views we are about to express do not represent the popular view. We are however disappointed by the lack of ambition in the plan overall and would urge the Neighbourhood Planning Group and local residents, employers, land-owners and stakeholders to think more creatively about what could be achieved for the village and all current and future stakeholders.</p> <p>Reading the plan gives us the distinct impression that there has been a tangible resistance to change and innovation. We</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>The contents of the draft plan reflect the feedback provided to the Steering Group following extensive consultation with all stakeholders, including two public surveys.</p>

			<p>understand that there is a wish to retain what is good about the village and the community for those who already live, work and visit.</p> <p>However, in spite of the draft plan purporting to support the development of a SUSTAINABLE community for the future, there is no signaling of the need seek a balance to retain all that is good, BUT at the same time to look outward, to develop, to grow, or perhaps to give younger and newer residents any significant opportunity to settle in the village and enjoy the potential that this community has to offer.</p> <p>For example, the text highlights the decline in public transport. It states that services have run-down to the current number of three services daily. But it does not focus on why that decline has happened. It does not investigate what the community could do to reverse the decline or create a demand.</p> <p>The problems are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have an ageing population that is becoming, over time, significantly less economically active; • We are failing to build affordable and or social housing to attract new, younger residents and families to the village; • We are preventing population growth so that more people of the type who need and want public transport services are discouraged from living in our community. <p>Why is it a surprise therefore that bus companies cannot afford to serve the village?</p> <p>So instead of backing a plan that leads to growth, the draft seems to hunker down, ignoring the realities of modern lives and modern communities. It does not try to 'future proof' the village.</p> <p>As an indication of the lack of ambition of the draft Neighbourhood Plan, we highlight that the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limits housing developments to one property per year (on average); • Does not support new businesses, entrepreneurship or 	<p>As public transport services do not fall within the scope of land use planning, we are unable to influence these matters through the Neighbourhood Plan. You will note, however, that we have identified similar aspirations under AP 5.3.1.</p> <p>We do recognise that other planning and development policies (such as you refer to) will directly impact the viability and sustainability of public transport provision which has been highlighted as being of significant importance in the Stage 1 survey.</p> <p>The Steering Group has had to work within the boundaries of neighbourhood planning while achieving a consensus about what is appropriate and can be justified. We believe that the proposed policies are forward-looking, support innovative design and will help the village grow on a sustainable basis. We also believe that the village aspirations</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>employment opportunities, other than small developments in home working;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not support the development of sports and leisure facilities other than the children's play area (which already exists), and • Proposes only guided walks and more use of the Water Works museum to boost visitor numbers. <p>Sutton Poyntz is undoubtedly a very pretty village and a good place to live, if you are lucky enough to live here already. The draft plan seeks only to retain the status quo. It does not seek to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • broaden opportunities; • build diversity; • welcome new residents; • provide lower cost owner occupied housing, • develop social or rented housing, or • contribute to solving the broader housing crisis that is hitting the young and the poor across our country and our region. <p>The chances of younger people, or those less wealthy, coming to the village are extremely remote. Instead of striving to be good citizens and helping those less fortunate than ourselves, we are proposing to close our doors to newcomers.</p> <p>We set a target housing growth of one per year. This figure is risible and unconscionable in any fair society. We need to do more, be more ambitious and set a sustainable and supportable development target that retains village values, but spreads the benefits to a wider, more active, more diverse, more sustainable community. We do not need to be radical - would forty, or even sixty affordable homes rather than the ten proposed, really destroy our quality of life? We think that is unlikely.</p> <p>We understand the need to retain the character of the centre of the village and try to use vernacular designs and materials that complement the existing properties. However, are there not parts</p>	<p>will help the community evolve in the direction that you suggest.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>of the village where new and innovative buildings, designs and materials could not be of benefit? New materials are not without aesthetic value and are far more ecological and sustainable than those proposed in the plan. Why are we not allowing new technologies to be considered when planning applications are sought? Do we want to be sustainable in the modern world, or do we want to aspire only to join the Prince of Wales school of architecture and create a faux Thomas Hardy theme park?</p> <p>We do not expect these views to be popular. But we feel it is important that more creativity and innovation is built into the plans for a Sutton Poyntz that is sustainable for future generations. We suspect we are lone voices. Thank you once again for the opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
4.	26/11/18	Resident	<p>Section 1.7, 2nd paragraph</p> <p>BNE2</p> <p>GA1</p>	<p>It's noted here that the Sutton Poyntz Society's planning policies do not align with those proposed by the Neighbourhood Plan. It goes without saying (or it should) that if the SPS has any future role in managing or monitoring the Neighbourhood Plan, then of course it would re-align its planning policies.</p> <p>The table at the top of page 14 shows reasons why certain areas are designated as Local Green Spaces. Presumably "Recreation" means that the area is currently (or potentially) used as a recreation area by the general public, in which case some of the ticks should be removed, in particular for G9 and G10.</p> <p>This policy seeks to ensure suitable street lighting for new developments. We currently benefit from superb "dark skies" allowing an amazing view of the starry sky with little pollution. I would like to propose that any new street lights added are carefully selected to avoid light spillage that could worsen the light pollution.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> CPRE (and others) recognise sites as</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>The definition of 'recreation' is much broader than suggested and is not restricted to areas of public access. The independent consultants' view was that areas G9 and G10 met the requirements of the NPPF criteria in this respect (see Ref 37).</p> <p>We agree that the policy GA1 could be improved. We have added an additional sentence to the effect that 'suitable street lighting shall be of a type that provides sufficient illumination without creating excessive light pollution'.</p>

				<p>being worthy of note, according to the number of stars visible in Orion. See: https://darkskydiary.files.wordpress.com/2012/01/cprestarcountmap2011.jpg Bad is fewer than 5, excellent is over 30 - on a good night I have counted in the mid-twenties.</p>	
			GA2	<p>The policy GA2.1 requires two parking spaces per new dwelling. I propose that this be clarified to exclude integral garages - we have seen in recent development applications, even before the houses are completed, that they can be freely changed into habitable rooms.</p> <p>The policy GA2.3 supports a small car park. I would like the authors to verify the size limit proposed (1000 m²) as this is pretty small and would hold about 40 cars – way fewer than the pub needs on a typical Sunday in summer.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> pp24-25 shows typical dimensions of spaces and gaps: https://www.rochford.gov.uk/sites/default/files/planning_parking_standards_design_and_good_practice.pdf</p>	<p>The Steering Group discussed policy GA2.1 but concluded it did not need to be changed. Regarding policy GA2.3, the size of the proposed car park is based on the need to cope with 40-50 cars. The Stage Two survey response showed a small majority in favour of a car park. Of those opposed, many were concerned about the aesthetic impact. We believe that the proposed size (based on experience with the temporary overflow car park at the Springhead) strikes a reasonable balance while reducing the pressure on on-street parking.</p>
			GA4	<p>This policy requires "electric vehicle charging points to be integrated into vehicle parking spaces".</p> <p>Which of the four commonly-used sockets would you like to be provided?!</p> <p>The latest proposal for the 2018 Weymouth & Portland Local Plan seems to no longer include any reference to the provision of charging facilities for electric vehicles. Maybe this is because, according to http://www.energysavingtrust.org.uk/scotland/grants-loans/domestic-charge-point-funding, "the typical cost for a home charge point and installation is approximately £1000".</p>	<p>Weymouth and Portland Borough Council feedback has indicated broad support for this policy (then GA 2.2) in line with emerging UK Government policy - <i>'Criteria GA2.2 requires adequate charging facilities. Currently contrary to National Policy however I understand that policy is being updated shortly. The Road to Zero (July 2018) Ensuring the houses we build in the coming years are electric vehicle ready. It is our intention that all new homes, where</i></p>

			<p>H&P1</p> <p>Also, the National Plan (NPPF) only asks for a suitable <u>location</u> for parking and charging a vehicle: [developments to be designed] "to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations." Consequently, I would exclude the requirement from the Neighbourhood Plan. (If it's <u>in</u> the Local or National Plans, it's not needed in the Neighbourhood Plan. If it's <u>not</u> in the Local Plan, then it needs more justification here.)</p> <p>Section 4.5, addressing Housing and Planning, repeatedly asks for new buildings to be built of "traditional materials" or those matching the adjacent houses. This sounds like another way of saying "don't change anything" – but personally I'd prefer we didn't live in the past. When Ernest Wamsley Lewis designed his houses in the village in the 1930's, no-one rejected his Planning Application saying, "you can't do anything innovative, you must copy the style and materials of the late-Georgian houses from 100 years ago". This policy is stating (for Plaisters Lane north) "any future development should be sympathetic to these important pre-war designs". How on earth are we to evolve if architects are constrained in a straitjacket that will force the village to become a Poundbury-like pastiche? Agreed, not every site is suitable for a Huf house or a "Grand Design" – but the charm of Plaisters Lane in particular is that every house is different. I would strongly encourage that at least some sections of the village be open to stunning architecture – which may be seen as revolutionary now but will be regarded as visionary by our descendants. I think it's also worth noting that even using traditional materials (stone, slate, etc.) it's still possible to build a house that I don't think the authors would want - but a footballer's girlfriend would love! I won't point to any current examples...</p>	<p><i>appropriate, should have a chargepoint available. We plan to consult as soon as possible on introducing a requirement for chargepoint infrastructure for new dwellings in England where appropriate.'</i> The Stage 2 survey also showed local majority stakeholder support for this policy.</p> <p>Policy H&P1 was developed following feedback from the community. Although there is a clear desire to retain the traditional look and feel of the village, we agree that the previous wording was too prescriptive and have amended it to reflect that innovative design (where appropriate) is welcome .</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Section 5 Here the document focuses on the “aspirations” of the village and lists about 27 “nice ideas” – which are easy to support in a Survey. Unfortunately, there is no suggestion of who is going to do all these things. The Sutton Poyntz Society struggles to get people to join the committee, and the same old faces reappear every time there is a call for volunteers to do <u>anything</u>. We are a village approaching 500 people, yet I struggle to recall a single activity, in the last five years (of the type listed in the aspirations) when more than a couple of dozen people have volunteered. (Maybe the only example I <u>can</u> think of is the annual cleaning of the pond for half-a-day - but with volunteers enticed by free coffee and bacon rolls! The Fayre is the other thing that brings the village together in serious numbers with over 30% of the village participating, but this is a fun social event, not a thankless task.)</p> <p>Annex This section, providing further info and maps about Biodiversity, seems inappropriately detailed for inclusion in the Plan. Five more pages on Biodiversity? On top of the six already included in Section 4.1? This seems out of proportion to the other sections.</p>	<p>Regarding Section 5, these are community aspirations, based on feedback received. We do not dispute that it will be challenging to realise these ambitions. A number of these aspirations are matters of information and guidance. Several build on actions already started and a number will require the involvement of public bodies and officials. The proposed monitoring group will be important in this context and we have revised the draft wording therefore to make this more explicit.</p> <p>Finally, we believe that it is important to retain the Annex on Biodiversity. Biodiversity was seen as a topic of key importance by stakeholders in both public surveys and we have sought to represent this in relation to land development policy. The material in question presents key information (such as the locally confirmed species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act) in a concise and readily accessible format which will be of value to those making planning decisions.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents
5	27/11/2018	Resident	<p>Section 1, 1.7 paragraph 2</p> <p>Section 2 2,2</p>	<p>NB Please note what I state is backed by experience and qualifications.</p> <p>The creation of a new body seems unnecessary primarily because of the relevance given in the Plan to trees, wildlife green corridors. The Planning Authority would be unable to rubber stamp any application without the applicant being asked to provide an Ecological report and an Arboricultural Report. These consultancy plans would create the monitoring aspect. Other requirements in the village can then be focused on under the umbrella of the Localism Act. The Society can enable these improvements.</p> <p>Green corridors are generally natural species of trees, shrubs and hedging which Puddledock Lane lacks in part due to conifers. There needs to be an uninterrupted permeable landscape – tarmac roadway and houses along the corridor are not.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>Further to your opening remarks, Section 1 has been expanded to explain the monitoring role in more detail and the proposed membership. A similar arrangement has been successfully introduced to monitor the Alton Neighbourhood Plan https://www.adra.community/residents-associations/alton-neighbourhood-plan-monitoring-group. Discussions will continue with the new Weymouth Town Council to determine the most effective arrangement to discharge the monitoring role.</p> <p>Green corridors have a much broader definition than suggested and may include railway embankments, river banks, canals, roadside verges, etc. The green corridor as defined in the plan is based around one such natural feature; the River Jordan and its</p>

			<p>Section 3 3.1 paragraph 2</p> <p>Section 4.1 Intro</p> <p>Map M-BNE2</p> <p>Policy BNE 3</p>	<p>The vision of ‘more people working locally’ cannot be fulfilled in the substance of the plan as there is no reference to where businesses could locate. Perhaps the vision is a hope more professional people will move into the village and work from home. The latter is becoming the norm.</p> <p>No Flood Risk Assessment Report so no substance as to how flora and fauna (indeed wildlife) can be protected. The area is high risk to medium. Very worrying that the consultancy used did not order one.</p> <p>Reference the table: Puddledock Lane allotments would be considered as wetland due to the risk of flooding. An Ecological Report would have picked this up.</p> <p>Reference Tree Preservation: No mention of Pines. Scrub trees being recommended for a TPO? e.g. blackthorn, crab apple. No Arboricultural Report.</p>	<p>tributaries. In its original form, this proposal arose from the work of the Place Appraisal sub-group which has been subject to extensive public consultation and support.</p> <p>On the question of ‘more people working locally’, the Stage 2 Survey pointed to a desire for business expansion through home working.</p> <p>Reference Section 4.1, we consider that, as sufficient publicly accessible information already exists, there is no merit in commissioning a further Flood Risk Assessment. We have referenced multiple sources in support of the policy, including the Environment Agency.</p> <p>From an ecological perspective, wetland consists of a distinct ecosystem on land that is permanently or seasonally under water and which contains characteristic aquatic species. We are confident that the Puddledock Lane ‘allotments’ do not fall within this categorization.</p> <p>On the question of tree preservation, an Arboricultural Report was considered at length by the Biodiversity Sub Group and the Steering Group but, after discussion with the council trees officer, it was decided that insufficient benefit would be gained by</p>
--	--	--	---	---	--

			4.3 GAI	Puddledock Lane again. Part of it is unadopted so costs of tarmac surfacing would fall on the frontage houses. The council have to have access so Hoggin is used yearly.	commissioning such a report.
			4.3 Justification	A large section of Puddledock lane is unadopted. To improve this surface would require expenditure to fall to the frontage houses or farm. Because the council bin lorries require access, the LA resurface yearly with Hoggin. Also, Puddledock Lane is signposted 'No Through Road' and requires more emphasis on this if it's felt traffic is exceeding that required for the residents there. Why allude to it becoming a 'Right of Way' for walkers?	Your comments about Puddledock Lane are noted. The majority of Puddledock Lane is a designated public right of way. The primary responsibility of the local authority is to maintain the public footpath. Hoggin has been used very recently, but not on an annual basis. However, some temporary repairs to assist safe pedestrian access have been undertaken at the instigation of residents.
			Policy GA2	On street parking particularly around the Springhead. If the Springhead were to place less emphasis on expanding their customer seating area there could be more parking bays. Close off Mission Lane and along the pond and have it pedestrianized.	
			4.4	Heritage listing usually includes buildings of interest and of historic value, design, materials and internal access periodically is given. The Forum's quest for such buildings is very questionable. Poorly advised perhaps?	The Heritage Report was done by a highly qualified and experienced architect. Internal access was not a prerequisite.
			Design Guidance p.28	Excellent. However, the requirements would place the onus on developers to comply and this will be reflected in the end sale price. Even professionals aiming to purchase will find such properties over-priced to mortgage even on their 'better than average' salaries.	We are pleased that you approve of the proposed design guidance. We have amended the wording to ensure that it is less prescriptive.

			<p>Policy H&P 3</p>	<p>And what of Affordable housing to attract the family of residents perhaps getting first option as occurs in parts of the New Forest? More bungalows needed for elderly people to downsize too and assisted housing instead of flats.</p> <p>Views do not stop development and Winslow Ave is in Preston. Not sure such criteria could be applied.</p> <p>Final comments. Pop shop –good Café – good.</p> <p>Play area at rear of Springhead – fine as long as pine cones don't hit a child! Who would benefit from this play area apart from those customers at the Springhead? It would create another attraction – more customers. Why another allotment site when one exists?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The report is based on a consultative document that <u>does not include</u> an Arboricultural Report or an Ecological Report carried out by those qualified. There are many suppositions being made without evidence from those qualified to do so. Also, the absence of a Flood Risk Assessment I have already mentioned. The consultants used did not contact the appropriate professionals to 	<p>On the question of affordable housing, the plan already acknowledges rural exception sites. Sites have not been allocated in the plan, but it does not seek to restrict such allocations.</p> <p>Regarding policy H&P3, the Winslow Ave view is from the footpath on the boundary of the Neighbourhood Plan area and is a view of the village. It was independently assessed as a key view showing the village in the setting of the surrounding hills. Development is not prohibited within the view splays, but any development should be sympathetic to the views.</p> <p>On the question of 'allotments', there are, at present, no public allotments in the village (the existing allotments are a private, time-limited, arrangement). You highlight that the Neighbourhood Plan does not include an Arboricultural Report, an Ecological Report or a Flood Risk Assessment. The need for independent professional reports was considered at various stages in the neighbourhood planning process as we sought to achieve a</p>
--	--	--	-------------------------	--	--

				<p>substantiate some of the claims. Hopefully the Planning officers will ask for the appropriate information with their peripheral reports.</p>	<p>balance between the information already available in the public domain and the need for specialist advice. Wherever possible, we sought to reduce the cost by making use of local skills – where the required level of competency existed. From an ecology perspective, use was made of the information collected over the last ten years by the local Biodiversity Group (which is subject to independent verification by recorders appointed by Dorset Environmental Record Centre (DERC)). Other information was provided by volunteers accredited by Wessex Water and subject to verification by their ecologists. Where we have made use of information available in the public domain, these sources have been fully referenced.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
6	27/11/2018	Resident			<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p>

			Page 6 Para 2/3	Whilst understanding the new Weymouth Town Council "... may be unable to offer the level of oversight...", to pass responsibility completely to a local organisation will limit the checks and balances an overview creates.	We have revised the section in the Neighbourhood Plan describing the proposed monitoring role, following consultation with Weymouth Town Council.
			Page 8	It seems rather strange for a "Green Corridor" that between the end of Puddledock to beyond the pumping station, that it consists of a road, with the immediate housing on the west side. This seems to ignore all the open ground to the east of that road, surely a more suitable space for a green corridor. See also map p.13.	Regarding the 'Green Corridor', the River Jordan and its banks form a natural and clearly defined Green Corridor i.e. a narrow transit route. No comparable natural corridor exists to the east and, as you point out, the ground is open and exposed. The main tributary of the River Jordan to the east does form a key arm of the Green Corridor. This proposal received overwhelming support in the Stage 2 survey.
			Page 9 Para 3.2.1	Surely this should read "Retain and promote housing which meets the needs of existing, future and potential residents". As currently written, it is very exclusive.	Thank you for comment about the wording on page 9 but we consider that the existing sentence is sufficiently inclusive.
			Page 12 Para 1L. 18 Para 2L.8	Spelling 'herptiles' To include the word 'order to enhance ...'	The spelling of herptiles is correct. We have changed the words 'order to enhance'.
			Page 14 Justification BNE2	Again, referencing to the 'Green Corridor', I dispute the single road link as per page 8 above would "provide strong interconnectivity for wildlife transit ...". Surely the open land to the east provide far better opportunities.	
			Page 15 Summary BNE 3	You quote "... preservation of native and locally indigenous species ... Hazel, Ash, Field Maple, Pendunculate (ALSO KNOWN AS COMMON) Oak, Wayfaring Tree (Viburnum lantana - ALSO	Established trees and hedgerows including veteran trees cannot be replaced in a short

			<p>Page 17 GA1.3/ p 18 summary GA1</p> <p>Page 19 Policy GA2</p> <p>Page 22 “What makes Sutton Poyntz special”</p> <p>Page 24 Justification Policy HE2</p>	<p>KNOWN AS COMMON), Crab Apple, Blackthorn and Hawthorn ...” Whilst accepting their integral part to the landscape, they are extremely common, not threatened, fast to replace and regrow, and in my view not always worth protecting in their own right.</p> <p>Whilst “Promote(ing) the safety of pedestrians ...” is the Policy, the summary talks exclusively about “...new development ...” and does not directly address the lack of pavements on Sutton Road, Plaisters Lane and elsewhere. At night combined with the lack of street lighting, this pretty well requires one to drive for safety reasons.</p> <p>Given the narrowness of the roads, the stated intent of retaining character (p.9 et al), and the difficulty / cost of upgrading existing roads/pavements/lights, then there must be some justification in banning cars from the village entirely. Tied in with the support for a car park, this would address many of the issues being discussed. I speak as part of a two-car household.</p> <p>Can’t see the justification within this page for your statement “... although other more recent buildings outside the core have heritage significance ...” – SEE BELOW for further comment.</p> <p>As stated in a recent meeting, and also from this document, I am unable to identify what constitutes ‘locally important heritage assets’. You quote distinctiveness”, “significant age” and “important context”, as well as “architectural interest”. However, without any definition of these terms the decisions can be very subjective and could result in mis-listing, or conflict of interest.</p>	<p>period of time, if ever, either in terms of their ecological or amenity value.</p> <p>We can only address policy concerns about pedestrian safety in the context of new development. We don’t believe it is necessary (or realistic) to advocate the banning of cars from the village. On the other hand, a relatively small car park could significantly improve the on-street parking situation.</p> <p>Action on existing road safety issues is outside the scope of the planning remit, moreover, the Stage 2 survey results did not support the use of raised pavements. Please see GA 1.3 and 1.4 and the supporting narrative.</p> <p>You ask what constitutes a local heritage asset (page 24). The criteria are listed in Historic England guidance note 7 (Local Heritage Listing). More detail is to be found in the relevant Historic England selection guides. Historic England does not apply strict cut-off criteria. The selection is</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Page 25 Para 6</p> <p>Page 26</p> <p>Page 27 “West side”</p> <p>Page 27 “Plaisters Lane North”</p> <p>Page 28</p>	<p>The document states “... new dwellings will be built over the plan period at the same rate as the last 20 years ...” as an expectation – I believe the figure quoted at the last meeting was 20 buildings during this time. Whilst I have been unable to find exact percentage figures, I suspect that UK new dwelling build is accelerating, and I feel that Sutton Poyntz should fall into line on this.</p> <p>As a (relatively new) resident, one of the things I like about the village is the diversity of housing. There are no properties which do not ‘fit in’ – to me that is a positive, and not something that should clash with “... a character appropriate to their surroundings “. If it did why have architects?</p> <p>Referring again to the above, whose view is that the cul-de-sacs “... strike a discordant view ...”? This appears to be an extremely subjective view, and one not appropriate to this document.</p> <p>Again, why should “...Any future development... be sympathetic to these important pre-war designs ...” Architecture as with all design, is a developing art – would you only drive around in pre-war cars or watch B&W television? – I think not.</p> <p>Some references to ‘Gateway’ (safety of narrow roads with no pavements?) and ‘Puddledock South’. The document, on one hand, states the need for “good quality design” that does not discourage “innovation or change ...” whilst on the other hand encourages, a conservative, and almost negative, approach to the same. Details are always in the eye of the beholder</p>	<p>ultimately a matter of judgement, which is why we employed an independent and highly experienced consultant.</p> <p>You question the planned rate of building (page 25). The Stage 2 Survey indicated a preference for less than 20 new homes over the plan period, however, we have proposed a higher rate - to reflect the national need for more homes.</p> <p>You question the terminology (Gateway & Puddledock South) used on pages 26-28. This reflects the Place Appraisal wording where it was generally agreed that some of the 1960s and 1970s development was not as aesthetically pleasing (given the</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

			<p>Page 26 Policy H&P 2</p> <p>Page 30 Para 1</p> <p>Page 34 Policy H&P 4.2</p>	<p>Whilst a preference for “smaller (2 or 3 bedroom) homes is mentioned, but only “to meet local needs” there is no mention in the policy for what is termed “higher density” (last paragraph) housing i.e. flats, which have smaller footprints and can usually be more environmentally sound. In addition, given the price that even “smaller” houses are likely to be, a cheaper flat option would encourage people to move into Sutton Poyntz who aspire to living within the character the document purports to support.</p> <p>The phrase “change of use and development of gardens” needs to be expanded. As it stands it is extremely ambiguous and open to interpretation.</p> <p>Given the number of concreted forecourts and extended drive and parking areas that already exist should not the policy encourage and support existing drives to change to soakaways and porous runoffs/drives as well as specifying for future developments. It is included as an aspiration (page 41, 5.5) but perhaps should be stronger.</p>	<p>mishmash of styles) as other areas of the village. Our aim is to be objective about what is important - without being judgmental.</p> <p>The Stage 2 Survey demonstrated support for new innovative style and design. We have revised the design statement to highlight that innovative design, where appropriate, is supported.</p> <p>We have reviewed H&P2 to ensure that it is clearer about what is meant by ‘higher density’.</p> <p>You question the potential use of gardens (page 30). The Stage 2 Survey was generally in favour of building on gardens. The proposed policy supports this intent - where key views are not impacted. We don’t believe that further guidance is required.</p> <p>Regarding policy H&P4, we cannot include provisions for changes to existing properties that do not require planning permission (such as non-porous driveways) and can only include this for future developments.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

			Page 36	The document supports facilities for younger people – this should be tied in with providing affordable housing to attract younger families who have those younger children.	You raise the question of younger families (page 36). The plan is not against affordable housing and acknowledges rural exception sites. Although sites have not been allocated in the plan, it does not seek to restrict such allocations.
			Page 38	The comment of “non-native species of an inappropriate size” is again very subjective. If TPO’s have already been put in place, this comment seems to infer that the Neighbourhood Plan will seek to remove these – is that the case?	Regarding page 38, there is no intention to seek the removal of existing TPO’s. The statement highlights the importance of assessing the proposed species and location carefully in order to avoid future problems.
			General Comments	These comments are my personal views. Any part of the document not commented on does not imply agreement or disagreement with just no particular view at present.	Once again, thank you for your comments. We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents

7	06/12/2018	Resident	3.2 MAP M-BNE 2 Policy HE1	<p>We would like to agree and endorse the 7 “Summary Objectives”.</p> <p>Areas for designation: We question why areas G2 (veterans wood) and G3 (Area of Fen) have been given a “NO” under the wildlife heading/category. These areas are in our experience equally important for wildlife, especially birds, as the other designated areas.</p> <p>We strongly support the proposal that any future development on previously undeveloped land should be subject to an archaeological assessment of the site.</p> <p>General comments: We really appreciate the hard work and ongoing efforts of the steering group in producing such a detailed and comprehensive village plan.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>Thank you for pointing out the error in the key to Map M-BNE 2. This was a transcription error which has been corrected.</p> <p>Your support for policy HE1 is noted.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
8	09/12/2018	Resident	Section 4.1 Biodiversity etc. Section 4.2 Business etc.	<p>Comment 1: The protection of green corridors and spaces is of paramount importance to this village and cannot be stated strongly enough. These areas and spaces are important in defining the character of the village as well as protecting and enhancing wildlife and biodiversity.</p> <p>Comment 2: The objectives here are correctly stated as aspirational. The notion of the village becoming a focus for</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>The business aspirations you mention are representative of the feedback received in</p>

			<p>significant business and employment opportunity is fanciful and apart from the village pub there are no other significant employers. Home based employment, as stated, is all that there is, and the idea of a local village shop is a pipe dream. The enthusiasm for this would quickly wane, once the novelty has passed.</p>	<p>the Stage 1 & 2 Surveys.</p>
		<p>Section 4.3 Getting Around</p>	<p>Comment 3: Would have liked to see more concerted action to introduce speed restriction and traffic calming measures in the area around the Cart Shed and junction of Plaisters Lane and Sutton Road where there are various concealed entrances and exits. While a 20-mph limit may not be warranted, a Speed Indicating Device (SID) would be useful in reminding drivers of the speed they are doing and draw attention to potential hazards.</p>	<p>On the question of speed restrictions, there was insufficient public support for such measures in the Stage 2 Survey, moreover, a site visit with a representative of the Highways Agency did not identify specific options - given the expressed desire of the community to avoid obtrusive signs and warning devices.</p>
		<p>Section 4.4 Heritage</p>	<p>Comment 4: Policy HE2 is important as it will support the development of a more comprehensive Conservation Area Appraisal for the village.</p>	
		<p>Section 4.5 Housing & Planning</p>	<p>Comment 5: Arguably the most contentious area of the Neighbourhood Plan, any decisions concerning development boundary changes and calls for development sites need to be taken by the Local Authority and Planners and not left in the hands of speculative developers, who seek to build purely for profit.</p>	<p>Regarding the Defined Development Boundary, we agree that not proposing a change to the boundary and therefore not calling for sites was a difficult decision. However, as the Stage 2 Survey showed no appetite for any change, it was decided that such decisions should be left to the Local Authority and Planners - albeit that this potentially reduces the village's ability to influence future development.</p>
		<p>Section 5.4 Community Aspirations</p>	<p>I fully support Policy AP5.4.1 to develop an improved Conservation Area Appraisal and to ensure that the village is protected from unsympathetic housing developments, regardless of where they</p>	<p>Once again, thank you for your comments. We have now submitted the draft</p>

				<p>occur, in the Historic Core or in any of the adjacent Plan areas. The Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan and supporting Place Appraisal provide for a very thorough and comprehensive view of the issues likely to affect the village community over the next 10-20 years and as such should be welcomed by the local authorities and planners in arriving at sound and pragmatic solutions concerning future developments, especially housing needs and transport, but also environmental protection.</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
9	12/12/2018	Resident	<p>BNE-2</p> <p>General comments</p>	<p>We see that the fields opposite us on Puddledock Lane South are part of the 'Green Corridor' but are not a 'green space'. Will they still have protection in the future? Does the 'gap' policy give them the same level of protection from development as the Green Space policy?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>You question the level of protection offered to the fields opposite Puddledock Lane South. This area was considered as a potential site for Local Green Space (LGS) as part of the independent consultant's assessment and is designated as site G11 in that report (reference 37). The consultant concluded that <i>"site G11 meets the NPPF eligibility requirements. It is less clear cut whether it meets the NPPF criteria, although a case could be made on grounds of wildlife value. However, if the prime objective is to protect the site from development that coalesces Sutton Poyntz with Preston, then the existing Local Plan policies covering the site are more appropriate i.e. it is part of an Open Gap and is outside the Defined Development Boundary."</i></p>

				<p>A detailed and very comprehensive work. Thank you to all concerned.</p>	<p>The Steering Group respected this finding and hence the area was not allocated as LGS. Thus, although LGS designation would have provided a higher level of protection, it was felt that the protections provided by the Defined Development Boundary and, in particular, the Open Gap designation was adequate in this particular case.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents.</p>
10	15/12/2018	Resident	BNE2 page 13	<p>This is a difficult one for me. On one hand I welcome that certain areas will be protected and voted accordingly. However, at the time I believed that the relevant landowners had been consulted which apparently was not the case. On the other hand, I admit to a certain bias as I have been an 'allotment' holder on the plot G9 for many years (see also AP5.6.6 below) and, although it has been explained, I still do not understand how it is that an area which is actually a private garden can be amongst those allocated.</p> <p>I also question why this particular space has been given a <i>yes</i> (table page 14) for recreation? I believe that this was given by the independent survey. I have always clearly understood that the land was the allocated area for gardens for the farm cottages and for much of the time that I have been there (more than 35 years) I have gardened alongside residents of those cottages, including</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>The criteria allow for private gardens to be designated as green space, although G9 is better described as private land as it does not form the curtilage to a residence.</p> <p>In order to obtain an objective and unbiased view, the SG commissioned an independent professional assessment and have respected the outcomes of the resulting report. Use for recreation purposes relates to its past and current use for horticulture. The criteria do</p>

			<p>GA 2.3 page 20</p>	<p>Herbie, after whom the garden is now named (how many people now in the village remember Herbie I wonder?), and his sons, the farmer who formerly lived in Puddledock Dairy House but who moved to the cottages, and his wife. In all those years it has never been a public space and I was only there at the invitation of the farmer and family. He moved from the area, and died a few years ago, hence the eventual selling of the land to other cottage residents, who continue to use it as their garden and who kindly allowed us to remain there. The only recreation involved was the private gardening of a few individuals.</p> <p>It was evident, when talking to several people shortly after the survey last December, that a number of residents believed, at the time, that a local green space, as referred to in that survey, meant <i>public space</i>, giving them the right to go where they had not been able to go before. I am not sure why they thought that, but they did and, until they were put right, some acted upon that presumption straight away, further upsetting landowners.</p> <p>I opted for the possibility of a car park within the village and still hope that it might help to improve the pond 'experience', although I have no suggestions as to where it might sympathetically go. However, having visited Moreton several times during the past summer, I am sceptical as to whether it <i>would</i> work. There are a number of low-key attractions within that village, as there have been for many years, and the village provided free parking in a lovely spacious and flat field right in the heart of the village. It was completely ignored by many people who still preferred to park alongside the narrow roads, on the verges and as close to the river ford, cafes and gardens as they could possibly get. In turn this led to numerous unsightly signs unsuccessfully asking people to not park on the verges, but in the car park. We need to be very careful</p>	<p>not differentiate between private or public use in this respect. The relevant extract from the report states that "<i>The site has been in long term and regular use for horticulture, providing several growing plots which are used by local residents.</i>"</p> <p>This aligns with the information provided in your response.</p> <p>Had the context statement associated with Question 4 contained specific reference to the question of public access, such misperceptions might have been avoided, or at least minimized. However, the context statement did make it clear that designation was subject to public feedback and meeting the assessment criteria.</p> <p>You make some important observations about parking provision that will need to be taken into account in planning such a facility.</p>
--	--	--	-----------------------	--	--

			<p>H&P1 – Building style and design Page 26-29</p> <p>SR2 page 37</p> <p>AP 5.6.2 page</p>	<p>what we wish for and how we manage it.</p> <p>In the survey last December there was a majority agreement for contemporary/innovative design in areas other than the historic core (134 on the agree side and 127 on the disagree side), yet that is not reflected here. In fact, the design guidance has gone the other way and is quite prescriptive. Why is that? House design is, of course, very subjective, but I feel that all plans should be judged on a case by case basis and I worry that they will be dismissed out of hand simply because they do not fit the design guidance if it is accepted. If we are not careful, we will end up with a historic village core (all be it somewhat sterile with many second homes and rental properties), with non-descript outskirts.</p> <p>I think that we have to accept that it is most likely that the best houses will be built by individuals for themselves, as, these days, developers will nearly always go for profit. Having said that, there are a few exceptions around the village. For instance, The Old Stables, which reflect the former use of their site but in a more modern spacious way. Would they pass scrutiny or even be built by profit-led developers these days?</p> <p>There is, apparently, support for a children’s play area within the village, in spite of the fact that there are several good council-run areas close by and also one in the pub (although I concede that politeness requires that using that one would require the purchase of drink or food). However, who is prepared to put their name forward as the 24-hour contact in the case of problems or emergencies, as displayed on the gates of some other village run play areas? Who is going to pay for it, build it, insure it, maintain it and be responsible for health and safety? There may be someone now, but will they still be around in 5-10 years?</p> <p>This is very prescriptive and intrusive and will, I hope, be subject to</p>	<p>Policy H&P1 was put together following the Stage 2 Survey and reflects the community’s desire to retain the traditional look and feel of the village. However, we believe that the wording is too proscriptive about innovative design and have revised it accordingly.</p> <p>The proposal for a children’s play area reflects longstanding support within the community, as recorded in previous village reports and identified (again) in the Stage 2 Survey. There may well be operational issues to be resolved, but the first step should be to agree the need and develop a suitable policy.</p> <p>We agree that a balance needs to be</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

			42	suitable flexibility. Some people are more zealous in the task of overseeing such a policy than others, and it could end in tears.	achieved in the management of trees, which we have tried to reflect - taking into account the feedback received in the Stage 2 Survey.
			AP 5.1.2-4 page 38	Trees are a very emotive subject and have the potential to upset lives. It is costly and tricky enough to maintain basic upkeep anyhow, without the prospect of the 'tree police' calling. On the other hand, unmaintained trees can be dangerous and can grow to such heights and widths as to destroy longstanding vistas. I am pleased to see that a slight consideration about planting that obscures views has been mentioned, in a different context, in the first paragraph of page 29. As I said for GA 2.3, we need to be very careful	It is important in this respect to distinguish between 'statutory' allotment sites which is what the aspiration seeks, and land used as allotments by private contractual arrangement.
			AP 5.6.6 page 42	There is more than a slight hint of irony in the desire to provide community allotments when the pursuance of allocating a private garden (G9) as a local green space (BNE 2 – page 13) has, in the end, contributed towards eviction notices being issued to the several long standing members of the community who have gardened there for many years (in my case between 35 and 40 years). There is, I am sure, a much more complicated story behind the landowner's decision, but the whole sorry matter of local residents being used as bargaining chips, initially without their knowledge, has led to a great deal of upset.	We note your comments about the time available for consultation. The Stage 2 Survey was distributed to stakeholders in the last few days of November 2017 and we continued to accept replies until late January 2018 - to help compensate for the Christmas and New Year period.
			General Comments	I would first like to say that it is to the credit of the steering group that they have arrived at this point. Just because I do not agree with some of the aspirations/objectives does not mean that I do not understand just how much of their time and effort has been given over to this project and I admire them for it. It was always going to be a thankless task. I cannot believe how naïve I was when I completed the survey a	Once again, thank you for your comments. We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at:

				<p>year ago. I completed it in a rush mainly due to the poor timing (December – people tend to be very busy leading up to Christmas). Many people have told me that they feel similarly and that they regret some of their answers. I certainly do.</p> <p>I feel that the project has divided the village (probably because it has given residents a public forum on which to air their views) and wonder what the situation would be now had it not started. There are many long-standing residents who have witnessed a great deal of change over the years and who, voluntarily or in the line of their employment, or both, have given much to the village and wider community. There are others who are not aware of that, yet who are happy to accuse people of not wanting change. Some of the comments made in response to last year's survey were downright offensive (<i>.....very elderly; they should move out – Preston is not far!</i> (Taken from comments on the Place Appraisal) for instance.) Also, from reading all the letters, agendas and minutes, it would appear that the process initially had something of a similar effect within the steering group itself, with stronger personalities trying to dominate and even going against the wishes of the rest of the group on occasion. It is my hope that the plan will manage to steer a middle path and partially placate both sides, otherwise I do not believe that it will be acceptable.</p> <p>There is much that is good in the plan, but for the sake of brevity I have commented only on those areas that I do not like which is why I am appearing to be so negative. That is not actually entirely the case.</p>	http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents
11	17/12/18	Ruth Hall Planning Liaison Wessex Water Claverton Down Bath BA2 7WW wessexwater.co	SR1	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Wessex Water is referred to as both Wessex Water and Wessex Water plc. Please can Wessex Water be used consistently throughout.</p> <p>We discussed with the Neighbourhood Plan Group that we did not</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>Thank you for highlighting the inconsistency</p>

		.uk Stakeholder	Section 5.2 Section 5.6 and AP 5.6.1	believe the formal designation of the Waterworks Museum as a community asset to be appropriate given the location of the facility within an operational water treatment works. These discussions have been reflected within the supporting text to Policy SR1. While we appreciate that Section 5: Community Aspirations are not planning policies but 'action points for the community' we have concerns about the way in which the future possibilities for the Waterworks Museum have been presented. The Waterworks Museum is located within an operational water treatment works and as such there are strict measures in place to ensure the security of the water treatment process. Visitors are accompanied to ensure the security of the site and the safety of visitors and it would not be appropriate for volunteer guides to assume this role. The operational nature of the site and the need for visitors to be accompanied mean that it is not feasible for the Waterworks Museum to incorporate other uses as referenced in Section 5.2 ' <i>Possibilities exist for incorporating other uses, such as a café, information point and arts and crafts exhibition area</i> ' and further references to the same effect in Section 5.6 and AP5.6.1. We wish to see Section 5 amended as believe it is misleading for members of the community reading the plan as to what is appropriate.	in nomenclature. This has been corrected. We acknowledge your concerns about access to the Waterworks Museum and the importance attached to security and safety. The village feels privileged to have been able to make use of the Museum on special occasions. We are grateful for Wessex Water's willingness to support the community in this regard. We have amended the wording at para 5.2 and 5.6 to make it clear that aspirations must be consistent with operational, security and safety considerations. Once again, thank you for your comments. We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents
12	17/12/18	Resident		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment 1: It is important that the Plan reflects the overall views of the community as represented by feedback received during the informal consultation stages and provides policies that are aligned with those views as well as being clear, practical and able to be implemented. 	Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.

			Other comments	<p>undertaken, which has been subject to extensive public consultation, open discussion and amendment, it is entirely appropriate that a list of non-designated heritage assets be included as an Annex to the Neighbourhood Plan and cross-referenced to policy HE 2, rather than hidden away as a reference to the assessment report. The list would reflect the properties listed as suitable in the final version of that architectural assessment (reference 48). Can I suggest that the policy be strengthened by replacing the existing policy with the following slightly amended policy?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Locally Important Heritage Assets will be protected as specified in the Local Plan. A provisional list of assets has been developed for the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Area (Annex 2) for ratification and incorporation by the Local Authority into the Local Plan’. • I strongly support this Neighbourhood Plan which has been based upon extensive public consultation. 	<p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
13	18/12/2018	Resident	Policy H&P2	<p>There is no comment about changing the development boundary. but it does say that around 20 new homes are thought to be appropriate.</p> <p>If there is no change to the development boundary the only new houses will be the odd infill property. I cannot see that 20 new</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>The SG did discuss the feasibility of building 20 new homes within the Defined</p>

			<p>Section 4.5 Housing and Planning</p> <p>General</p>	<p>houses can be built inside the boundary and would like to see evidence that the group considered the feasibility of the proposal before putting it in the plan. I would like to see evidence that the group have considered where these new properties might be built. It would appear to me that to achieve the building of 20 new houses, existing buildings would need to be demolished; that scenario reality, isn't going to happen.</p> <p>We have lived in the village for 20 years. Our children have grown up here and now have children of their own. We would like it if they could live here and were hoping that the Neighbourhood plan would address this. I am aware that at least one landowner has offered land for low cost or shared equity housing, but the plan makes no mention of this. It is very disappointing that the plan seems to be about stopping future development and as no new locations for housing are being considered it seems unlikely that, if this plan is adopted there will be any provision of housing for my children and grandchildren. This is an opportunity missed and as the plan runs for 20 years it will mean my family can never aspire to live in the village where they grew up. I feel a carefully planned and sympathetic scheme working in harmony with local village needs and opinions would go a long way to alleviate our responsibility to provide development land considering the governments national shortage.</p> <p>I note in the introduction that small scale exceptions are acknowledged as a possibility outside the development boundary (rural exception sites) and would hope that the final version of the plan will expand on what this might mean.</p>	<p>Development Boundary (DDB). The conclusion was that this was going to be difficult, but not impossible. It should be noted three new dwellings are likely to be built within the village this year (FY18/19), on top of four new dwellings completed in FY 17/18. Nevertheless, it is proposed that the rate of building should be monitored to determine whether a change in the DDB is required.</p> <p>The draft plan acknowledges rural exception sites (page 25 H&P introduction paragraph 4) and is certainly not against affordable housing. Although sites have not been allocated, the plan does not seek to restrict such allocations.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents
14	19/12/2018	Resident	General Points	<p>Whilst we appreciate the publication of this draft neighbourhood plan represents a significant delivery milestone for the Steering Group, it also represents a significant opportunity for impacted stakeholders to raise their objections formally and request amendments to the plan.</p> <p>We became aware during the Stage 2 Survey in December 2017 that the neighbourhood plan would contain policies which directly impacted our land and (at that time directly impact) our property. Since then we have attended nearly every Steering Group meeting as observers. Whilst we are grateful that the Steering Group has allowed us to contribute to discussions and raise objections during these meetings, there remain some un-resolved issues.</p> <p>Please find our consultation response to the Draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>N.B. To assist with response analysis we have indicated which sections and/or policies of the plan our comments relate to.</p> <p>1. Sutton Poyntz Place Appraisal</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan (hereafter referred to as the plan) makes reference to the Sutton Poyntz Place Appraisal on numerous occasions. From attending the Steering Group Meeting on 16th October 2018, we were of the understanding that the Place Appraisal would be an archived document providing a snap shot in time and was no longer a “live” document once the plan is submitted. The plan states that “The Place Appraisal has been continuously reviewed throughout the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan” (p4). However, the plan does not set out how the Place Appraisal should be considered in the future.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>The Place Appraisal is no longer a ‘live’ document; however, it is extensively referenced by the Neighbourhood Plan and is reviewed routinely to ensure that there are no errors, inaccuracies or inconsistencies. The relevant paragraph has been revised to make this clear.</p>

			<p>Additionally, the Sutton Poyntz Place Appraisal makes reference to an Aspen tree within our woodland (G10), this has been found to be incorrect by an independent tree surgeon: Aaron Giffen Ltd.¹, who confirms the reported Aspen is in fact a Black Poplar. We discuss this further within our comments on Policy BNE 2.</p> <p>Action: Additional text be added to the plan which makes clear that the Place Appraisal is an archived document, available for reference and helpful context only. We would recommend this is included via a footnote every time the Place Appraisal is mentioned within the document. At the very least it should be clarified within the foreword.</p> <p>Action: The Sutton Poyntz Place Appraisal which reports an Apsen within our woodland should be corrected to Black Poplar.</p> <p>2. Ordering of the Policies</p> <p>Action: We request the policies are re-ordered so that the housing and planning section appears earlier within the plan. The ordering of polices within the plan should reflect the purpose and objective of a neighbourhood plan which is to: create a strategy for development in local communities; “shape the development and growth of their local area”.²</p> <p>3. Anti-development Approach</p> <p>Given that the purpose and objective of a neighbourhood plan is to: create a strategy for development in local communities; “shape the development and growth of their local area”.³ The Plan seems to be focused on making development so onerous it is impossible. The plan commits to an alarmingly low number of new homes: 20</p>	<p>You question the description of the ‘Aspen tree’ within G10. This this has been referred to as Aspen for many years but we acknowledge it is very difficult to differentiate Aspen from Black Poplar. Although we have provided a written note explaining the scientific basis for the designation, we have amended the text to refer to this tree as Populus sp.</p> <p>You mention the ordering of policies. Neighbourhood Plans vary considerably in their ordering of contents. The Steering Group decided in November 2017 that alphabetical listing was the best option.</p> <p>You suggest that the draft plan is anti-development. This has certainly not been the Steering Group’s intention; indeed, we have been positive about continued development in the village. None of the</p>
--	--	--	--	---

¹ <http://arrongiffentreesurgeon.co.uk/>

² <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2>

³ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2>

			<p>and does not provide an accompanying feasibility assessment or delivery plan to achieve this target. When nationally we are faced with a housing crisis it really feels like Sutton Poyntz is pulling up the drawbridge rather than working to make a village which could survive and indeed thrive in the future. We make more specific comments relating to Section 4.5 Housing and Planning below.</p> <p>Comments by section or policy</p> <p>The consultation list has been over simplified it omits consultation with home owners whose properties are included within the provisional heritage asset report.</p> <p>Consultation with impacted landowners within the village. The first-time landowners were informed their land would be impacted by Local Green Space (LGS) designation was within the Stage Two Survey (1st December 2017). There was no prior notification.</p> <p>At least three of the private land owners impacted objected and felt the related consultation question was leading and the justification for LGS designation was not clear. At the 19th December 2017 Steering Group meeting they agreed to withdraw the LGS consultation question and that an independent consultant would be engaged in order to independently identify potential LGS sites⁴.</p> <p>Following the consultant’s independent LGS report, impacted land owners were allowed one month to comment and “raise inaccuracies”.</p> <p>The conclusion of our objection and subsequent discussion</p>	<p>proposed policies prevent or hinder new building. They do, however, seek to shape development in the village, consistent with local and national needs.</p> <p>The consultation listed in the plan is a summary of the more detailed information available in the Consultation Statement. We agree that the consultation with home owners was an important part of the process and this is now highlighted.</p> <p>We acknowledge that several (but not all) landowners potentially affected by the potential Local Green Space (LGS) designation (identified in the Stage 2 Survey) were concerned they were not informed before other stakeholders. However, they were able to raise their individual concerns at the subsequent Steering Group and many have attended the majority of subsequent meetings where they were able to engage actively about the issue. Landowners were also encouraged to provide detailed written comments in response to the independent report, commissioned by the Steering Group. The Steering Group has also provided additional references and detailed specific</p>
--	--	--	---	---

⁴http://www.suttonpoyntz.org.uk/images/Neighbourhood/Meetings/2017_12_19_Minutes.pdf.

			<p>1.6 How Were Stake-holders Consulted</p> <p>resulted in a stale mate between the Crocker family and the Steering Group. We, the landowner, do not believe the Steering Group’s wildlife/biodiversity evidence is sufficient to justify designation, however, the Steering Group believe it is. We were told by the Steering Group that we can challenge their evidence base further during the formal consultation process.</p> <p>Consultation with home owners impacted by the heritage asset report. The first-time homeowners were informed their property would be impacted by local heritage asset designation was via a leaflet one week before the Stage Two Survey opened (1st December 2017). There was no evidence or justification for the designation provided to the home owner. At the 19th December 2017 Steering Group meeting the Steering Group agreed to withdraw the consultation question and that a heritage asset assessment would be put on hold, and if it were to progress, an independent consultant would be engaged.⁵ In August 2018 funds were secured and a consultant produced a heritage asset report. Impacted home owners received the report on 7th September 2018 and were asked to consider the report and flag inaccuracies within three weeks. Feedback was considered at the following Steering Group meeting (25th September 2018) and a meeting with the report writer was offered to impacted home owners. This meeting was offered with less than three days’ notice; which meant we could not attend. This represented very poor consultation. Action: We request that the following new text is added to this section: “Property owners whose properties are included within the heritage asset report were consulted September -October 2018.</p>	<p>wildlife species evidence in support of the consultants’ report whenever requested.</p> <p>A similar approach has been taken in regard to local heritage assets where an independent report was commissioned and made available for comment by stakeholders. This included a public meeting with the consultant, in addition to the opportunity to discuss the recommendations in detail at subsequent Steering Group meetings.</p> <p>A detailed chronological record of all consultation with stakeholders is provided in the Consultation Statement. This has been reviewed to ensure that it reflects each step in the process as well as the results of each consultation – including any disagreements or concerns raised by stakeholders.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

⁵ http://www.suttonpoyntz.org.uk/images/Neighbourhood/Meetings/2017_12_19_Minutes.pdf

			<p>1.7 Management and Monitoring</p>	<p>N.B. A number of villagers impacted by some policies have raised objections and several of these remain unresolved.”</p> <p>This section is greatly concerning; we strongly object to all proposals from the Steering Group which relate to delegating monitoring responsibility to a local organisation.</p> <p>For the record the only monitoring body we will support and recognise is Weymouth Town Council and/or Dorset Council.</p> <p>The Steering Group’s proposal of the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group or the Sutton Poyntz Society fulfilling the monitoring duties involve a minority of <i>un-elected</i> village members “policing”/ “monitoring” the majority.</p> <p>The second paragraph in Section 1.7 contains “In doing so, the Sutton Poyntz Society could properly claim a democratic mandate in championing policies and aspirations formally agreed by the community.” The use of the term democratic mandate is incorrect, democratic mandate is the authority granted by a constituency to act as its representative. Although the neighbourhood plan may have been ratified by the village, the village will not have voted on the principle of the Sutton Poyntz Society acting as its representative, Action: Delete the phase “democratic mandate”.</p> <p>The Steering Group’s third suggestion of a Neighbourhood Council is unclear as to whether the council members would be elected. If not, again this would result in a minority of <i>un-elected</i> village members “policing”/ “monitoring” the majority.</p> <p>This section of the plan importantly fails to set out what exactly a monitoring body would/could monitor? Each policy should have a monitoring section setting out how it will be monitored, thereby allowing the monitoring methodology to be consulted on by village members. As a village resident directly impacted by the LGS policy and indirectly impacted by the heritage asset proposals we deserve to understand how those policies will be monitored.</p> <p>Action: To help allay village members fears and concerns this</p>	<p>You express concerns about the monitoring role – once the plan is made. We have continued to discuss the way forward with the shadow Town Clerk and have revised section 1.7 accordingly – based on the arrangements implemented by Alton Parish Council https://www.adra.community/residents-associations/alton-neighbourhood-plan-monitoring-group)</p> <p>You argue that each policy should have a monitoring section. Although, it would be ideal to be able to include specific metrics within each policy, this has not proved possible. Nevertheless, the ‘Summary of Intent’ section provides an adequate basis for effective monitoring of each policy – as other Neighbourhood Plans have demonstrated.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

			<p>Section 3.2 Summary Objectives</p> <p>Section 4.1 Biodiversity and The Natural Environment</p>	<p>section should include new text to stress that: the monitoring body has no powers to enforce or take action against village members. Action: Each policy should have a monitoring section setting out how it will be monitored.</p> <p>Objective 6: “Retain and enhance important green spaces found in and around the village.” Action: This objective should be clarified by a footnote, which explains that local green space designation does not include any legal powers to control the management of private land. As stated within Government Guidelines (Open space, sports and recreation facilities, public rights of way and local green space, paragraph 21⁶)</p> <p>This section includes the following statement: “The designation of areas of green space that shall be protected from development and destruction of habitat.” The destruction of habitat with regard to local green spaces cannot be guaranteed or prevented, as management of local green space cannot be prescribed for private land (Open space, sports and recreation facilities, public rights of way and local green space, paragraph 21⁷). Therefore, Action: The phrase “destruction of habitat” should be removed from the sentence within the plan.</p>	<p>We don’t believe it is necessary to provide a footnote to the village vision and objectives.</p> <hr/> <p>Regarding Section 4.1, we have revised the wording to align better with the policy intent. Thank you for highlighting this. On a more general point, the Steering Group recognises and appreciates your efforts to manage your land – to the benefit of the entire community. Your rights as a landowner have been acknowledged throughout. However, there is a natural beauty to your woodland, accentuated by the confluence of the Osmington Brook and River Jordan which flow westward, parallel to Puddledock Lane. The benefit of this lane as a public right of way for walkers, along the full length of G10 is significant and accords with NPPF criteria.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space#Local-Green-Space-designation>

⁷ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space#Local-Green-Space-designation>

			<p>BNE1 Protection and enhancement of wildlife habitat in relation to new development.</p>	<p>“Summary of Intent for Policy BNE1”</p> <p>The second paragraph of this summary beginning: “This policy aims to facilitate the maintenance and improvement of designated local green spaces....” does not relate to the BNE 1 Policy, the BNE 1 policy only relates to biodiversity/habitat conservation in relation to new development.</p> <p>The second paragraph does not mention development and does not fit with the policy; it does not summarize the preceding justification text nor does it reflect the policy title and objectives. Therefore, Action: the second paragraph is deleted or moved to the aspiration section: 5.1.</p> <p>The second paragraph of the policy within the text box begins: “Development will only be considered in the designated areas in very special circumstances where...”</p> <p>Paragraph 20 of Government Guidelines on Open space, sports and recreation facilities, public rights of way and local green space⁸ states: “Designating a green area as Local Green Space would give it protection consistent with that in respect of Green Belt [land]”.</p> <p>Paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework⁹ sets out exceptions when building on green belt land can be permitted. Action: We request the exemptions list contained within BNE 2 makes reference to exceptions contained within Paragraph 89 of the NPPF for green belt land.</p>	<p>We have amended this paragraph to more accurately reflect the intent of this policy.</p>
			<p>BNE 2 Local Green Spaces</p>	<p>Our land is listed as G10 (Riverside woodland area). The plan lists the criteria for our land being designated LGS as: beauty, wildlife, recreation and historic. We have objected to all of these criteria.</p> <p>Beauty- Beauty is claimed as people who walk along Puddledock Lane can look into our woodland. The woodland is private land</p>	

⁸ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space#Local-Green-Space-designation>

⁹ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/9-protecting-green-belt-land>

			<p>which we have managed with pride, our commitment and desire to maintain our land so that others may enjoy it has wavered since the threat of LGS designation has arisen. The beauty and views into the woodland cannot be guaranteed, land management and the fencing of boundary lines remains the responsibility of the land owner.</p> <p>Wildlife (biodiversity)- upon request the Steering Group shared the biodiversity data used to justify our designation.</p> <p>The independent LGS report (reference 37 within the plan) references only six data sources, three of which were produced by the biodiversity group. Our overarching concern is that the data collected by village members, including the Sutton Poyntz biodiversity group is not performed by experts and their data is not independently verified. Action: We therefore request all data collected by village members are discounted from wildlife (biodiversity) evidence base and justifications. Additionally, as our land is private with no access there is no data which directly relates to our woodland, the only agencies who have access to conduct surveys in our woodland are Wessex Water and the Environment Agency, with whom we fully co-operate.</p> <p>Upon request the hedgerow survey, fish survey and priority biodiversity species report (all of which are listed as resources within the LGS report) were shared with us, along with three additional reports, all of which have been completed by Sutton Poyntz's biodiversity group. I list the reference/data source and our concerns/issues.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Data Source</th> <th>Issues /Concerns</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bat Surveys, Knight Ecology (2011)</td> <td>This data is now 7 years old and is no longer relevant.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SP Gardenwatch 2016</td> <td>This data is collected by members of the village, who are not qualified</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Data Source	Issues /Concerns	Bat Surveys, Knight Ecology (2011)	This data is now 7 years old and is no longer relevant.	SP Gardenwatch 2016	This data is collected by members of the village, who are not qualified	<p>You cite concerns about the data employed in the LGS assessment. It was the consultants' view that the collection process aligned with the level of competency required and could be validated. Local data collection is collated by the Sutton Poyntz Biodiversity Group who check any "questionable" data with local 'competent' persons before submitting confirmed data to the Dorset Environmental Records Centre (DERC). The latter validate such data through accredited recorders before placing it on their data base which can take up to one year, particularly where further evidence is required. The Sutton Poyntz Biodiversity Group which produces a monthly newsletter has a link on the DERC web site.</p> <p>This data is provided by an independent and/or verifiable source and is relevant. Ecological data is generally accepted as current for at least 10 years. Some organisations such as the National Trust</p>
Data Source	Issues /Concerns									
Bat Surveys, Knight Ecology (2011)	This data is now 7 years old and is no longer relevant.									
SP Gardenwatch 2016	This data is collected by members of the village, who are not qualified									

				<p>biodiversity experts, their data is not independently verified. The data relates to species in Their own gardens and not ours woodland, the data resolution is not adequate. If this data is used to designate our woodland, the same principle could be followed, to designate any green space in the village including their own gardens.</p>	<p>work on a 12-year cycle before re-survey is suggested.</p>	
				<p>SP Gardenwatch 2017</p>	<p>Same as above.</p>	<p>On the specific question of bird returns, such data would typically be valid within a 1 km square. These records have been formally collected and reported monthly since 2008. Garden birdwatch records cover individual properties and the immediate area. An example recording form was provided as a matter of courtesy for illustration along with an example blank form – hence the “Your house” sub-heading.</p>
				<p>Example Bird Returns</p>	<p>This document is a record of birds seen/heard at a member of the Steering Group’s home address and one other location which is inexactly referenced within the report as “your house” Some of the data is 4 years old. This data has not been verified and is not sufficiently robust.</p>	<p>On the specific question of bird returns, such data would typically be valid within a 1 km square. These records have been formally collected and reported monthly since 2008. Garden birdwatch records cover individual properties and the immediate area. An example recording form was provided as a matter of courtesy for illustration along with an example blank form – hence the “Your house” sub-heading.</p>
				<p>Fish Summary Returns</p>	<p>This document contains a table which states that: Eel, Brown Trout, Roach and Bullhead were identified “Sept-2015-Present”. Another column states that: Eel, Brown Trout and Bullhead were identified “July 2016- Present”. Snapshots of data cannot be extrapolated to cover “the present”. Therefore, the</p>	<p>The fish data is an extract from a survey carried out by Wessex Water ecologists and which directly appertains to the River Jordan which flows through G10. The evidence is validated and part of an on-going scientific study. Aquatic evidence is entirely acceptable and relevant. Please note that European Eel travel over land as well as in water. As we have noted, the data provided in support of the LGS designation is valid and</p>

					data is 2 and 3 years old. We don't believe aquatic evidence should be used to support LGS designation.	has been subjected to external scrutiny. Evidence related to each of these species results from independent professional reports for Wessex Water and Weymouth and Portland Borough Council respectively as well as local reporting.
				Hedgesurveyrev 6	This survey was conducted by the Sutton Poyntz Biodiversity Group And refers to "A coppiced Aspen Tree unusual in Dorset is located here alongside the stream". This reported Aspen is within our woodland, G10. We have disputed the claims of Aspen since we became aware of them. We believed it was a Black Poplar. We submitted corrections to the Steering Group at the earliest opportunity and requested it was corrected to report a Black Poplar. The Steering Group did not accept our correction and felt they could ignore our comments. Frustrated by this stale mate we have employed, at cost to ourselves, a tree surgeon to verify the tree species of the disputed "Aspen". The tree surgeon ¹⁰ on 14 December 2018 confirmed the reported Aspen was in fact a	

¹⁰ <http://arrongiffentreesurgeon.co.uk/>

				<p>Black Poplar. The mis-reporting of the Aspen throws all the evidence collected by the Sutton Poyntz Biodiversity Group into doubt/question.</p> <p>Action: We therefore, again, request all data collected by village members are discounted from wildlife (biodiversity) evidence base and justification.</p>	
			Priority species index to map	<p>European Eel and Water Vole are reported for our woodland. IUCN Red List already provides conservation protection for both of these species. The water vole was reportedly spotted in 2013, this data is therefore 5 years old and is no longer relevant. European Eel is specifically protected and conserved via the UK Eel Management Plan. We don't believe aquatic evidence should be used to support LGS designation.</p>	
			Woodland along Puddledock Lane	<p>Again, this relates to the disputed Aspen which has been confirmed to be a Black Poplar. Please see our comments relating to "HedgeSurveyRev6".</p>	

			<p>BNE3 Tree Preservation HE2 Locally important heritage assets</p> <p>As LGS designation does not guarantee land management practices and therefore biodiversity benefits cannot be guaranteed; there is no guarantee the habitat will be maintained in such a manner as to remain attractive to the species the biodiversity group claim to be present within the woodland.</p> <p>Recreation value- G10 has no public access and is private land and as such we do not feel it meets the specification as it has no multi-functional use or recreational use. The Steering Group believe that the public right of way which runs parallel to the woodland “enables the recreational and amenity value of the proposed area[G10], including its beauty and tranquillity”. We strongly object to the recreational value of G10 being derived from the neighbouring public right of way.</p> <p>Historic- The fact the woodland lies within the historic core of the village does not mean it is historic, there are no significant historic relicts within the woodland and the age of the trees and shrubs within the woodland are not of significant age. Using this same rational a new house built within the historic core would qualify as historic.</p> <p>Action: As we have already raised these objections with the Steering Group, and they have been dismissed i.e. the stale mate referred to earlier in the letter and the fact they consider the evidence to be sufficient. We would like clarity from the Steering Group about how this objection will be resolved and who will arbitrate over this difference of opinion? As a way forward, we request that we are allocated a meeting with the local authority and the independent assessor to discuss this directly with them. Can the Steering Group commit to this approach?</p> <p>Action: Within all biodiversity supporting evidence, remove any reference to an Aspen within our woodland: G10, and correct it to Black Poplar.</p> <p>The third paragraph of “Summary of Intent for Policy BNE2” states</p>	<p>We recognise that you object strongly to the proposed designation. Although three other landowners have not objected to the proposed LGS designation, your concerns have never been dismissed, indeed changes have been made in several policy areas and in matters of detail, as a result of your submissions.</p> <p>We believe we have provided considerable evidence in support of the independent consultants’ report. However, if you, or the Local Authority, wish to commission a further study, we would be very happy to</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>that the “the potential financial impact of Local Green Space designation on land and property values has been quantified and documented.”. We submitted our letter setting out the negative financial impact of LGS designation to the Steering Group on 7 June 2018, within which we included two references which helped to demonstrate the negative financial impact. Only one of these references is used within the report- which when read out of context does not demonstrate the point. The Steering Group have omitted the reference from Horsham District Council which explicitly says: LGS designation “would have implications for the landowner in terms of devaluing the land.” https://www.horsham.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0014/43511/Neighbourhood-Planning-Conference-Workshop-FAQs.pdf</p> <p>Action: We request either our entire letter pertaining to financial impact of LGS designation (7th June 2018)is included as a reference or the link to Horsham District Council is used as an additional reference ensuring a balanced view; currently two references are used to demonstrate the positive financial impact of LGS designation and only one to demonstrate to the contrary, the addition of our letter or the direct link to Horsham’s District Council’s report will ensure balance.</p> <p>Action: Please can the Steering Group confirm that policy BNE 3 only applies to new development?</p> <p>Action: We request clarification of the HE2 policy: please can the policy title make reference to the fact it will be the local authority who will develop a list of heritage assets. Requested new text: “Locally Important Heritage Assets will be protected as specified in the Local Plan. The local authority will develop a list of such assets for the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan area.”</p> <p>This will then remain consistent with the third paragraph of “Justification for Policy HE2”.</p> <p>As our home: Rose Cottage is one of the un-listed properties along</p>	<p>contribute.</p> <p>We agree that there should be no reference to the financial implications of LGS designation and have revised the draft plan accordingly.</p> <p>We can confirm that policy BNE3 only refers to new development.</p> <p>Regarding policy HE2, this has been withdrawn and replaced by a community aspiration.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Section 4.5 – Housing and Planning</p> <p>Policy H&P2</p>	<p>Silver Street we are indirectly impacted by the heritage asset designation of Silver Street. The designation of Silver Street instead of our property: Rose Cottage is a welcomed compromise from the Steering Group. However, we request the text within brackets in paragraph 3 is re-worded to more closely reflect the content of the Heritage Asset Report.</p> <p>The plan currently states: “... the last of these consists of the “street” itself, not the cottages along it (although the cottages are part of the context for the street as well as for several listed buildings in the area)”.</p> <p>Whereas the Heritage Asset Report states that it is actually the lane which gives context to listed buildings: “The lane is framed by and gives context to listed buildings; Laurel Cottage, Blue Shutters, Sutton Mill and Mill House. Included for rarity and group value”</p> <p>Action: We request the Steering Group amend the text in brackets within the plan to be consistent with the Heritage Asset Report we propose some alternative text for use in the plan: “(although the cottages along Silver Street are not designated as heritage assets, they should give due regard to the designated Silver Street)”.</p> <p>Action: Please can the Steering Group commit to informing the local authority that households included within the provisional list of properties have not been able to formally object to their inclusion as a potential heritage asset; the local authority will need to allow for this within their delivery of this policy.</p> <p>Action: We would like to record our support for the following statement within this section: “The possibility of small-scale exceptions is noted, as long as they match the requirements of Local Plan (14) policy HOUS2 (on rural exception sites), subject to sustainability.”</p> <p>The Steering Group state that they anticipate 20 new homes being built in the next 20 years. They base this on the fact that 20 new homes were built in the preceding 20 years. There is no</p>	<p>We note your support for rural exception sites.</p> <p>The Steering Group did discuss the feasibility of building 20 new homes within the defined</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

			<p>accompanying feasibility assessment for the expected 20 homes, and they have not allocated any sites for development. As the Steering Group have decided to leave the development boundary unchanged, any new development would rely on infill and building two properties on a plot which previously held one. Infill cannot be predicted and depends on the actions of individual property owners. Therefore, the claims of 20 new homes are unsubstantiated.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the 20 homes which were built in the last 20 years did not have to pay heed to this Local Plan, which makes development increasingly difficult.</p> <p>Action: The Steering Group should conduct a feasibility assessment to accompany the claim that 20 new homes will be built in the next 20 years.</p> <p>This section states that “A priority will be to seek Tree Preservation Orders on those trees located in Local Green Spaces”.</p> <p>As a land owner impacted by LGS designation this is the first time we have been made aware of this intention and the related action point: 5.1.3. Action: We request that the Steering Group set out how they plan on identifying suitable trees, what will be their criteria, and most especially how and when do they plan on engaging land owners on this matter?</p> <p>Section 5.1 states that “relatively few [orders] exist in the neighbourhood plan area and some of these relate to non-native species of an inappropriate size for location”. This raises the concern that as a result of this aspiration and action point the neighbourhood plan area could have a disproportionately high number of orders. The only solace we can take is that the Steering Group cannot unilaterally secure a tree preservation order and that each needs to be independently assessed by the Local Authority.</p>	<p>development boundary (DDB). The conclusion was that this was going to be difficult, but not impossible. Although the Stage 2 Survey showed that the majority opinion in the village was against a change in the DDB, it was decided that the rate of growth should be monitored with a view to recommending changes if the number of new homes fall below the anticipated rate. It should be noted that three new dwellings are likely to be built within the village this year (FY18/19), on top of four new dwellings completed in FY 17/18.</p> <p>Please note that the progression of the community aspirations will fall to the new Weymouth Town Council.</p> <p>Finally, we recognise that there are relatively few TPO’s in the area at present. Allocation of any future TPO’s will need to follow the appropriate procedures.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
15	20/12/2018	Resident	<p>H&P</p> <p>Biodiversity</p> <p>BNE 3</p>	<p>I feel that the policy is too restrictive on design and doesn't allow for innovation. It tries to restrict development by limiting it to infill and so is unlikely to meet the demand expressed by the survey for smaller housing.</p> <p>This section is too long and too wordy and unrealistic.</p> <p>We have lost a lot of trees in the village over the years and we should encourage all householders, not just in new development, to plant more trees, especially when diseased ones have to be removed</p> <p>Thanks to the group who have obviously put in a lot of time and effort to produce this document.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>We have revised the wording regarding policy H&P1 to be less prescriptive about innovative design. We have also reviewed the section on Biodiversity.</p> <p>Regarding the planting of trees, we have sought to address these issues as part of the community aspirations (5.1.1. to 5.1.4).</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neigh</p>

					bourhood/documents
16	21/12/2018	Resident	Policy H&P 3 Key Views	I would suggest the view from the gate on the public footpath off Sutton Road is worthy as a key view. The view follows the proposed Green Corridor/Green Space towards Osmington.	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>Regarding key views, we commissioned an independent report on key views and have used that as the basis for our selection.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
17	21/12/2018	Nick Cardnell Weymouth and Portland Borough Council Stakeholder/St utory Consultee		<p><i>Introduction</i></p> <p>This document sets out Weymouth & Portland Borough Councils comments on the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Draft (6 November 2018). This response considers the extent to which the Plan complies with National Policy and Guidance (primarily the National Planning Policy Framework, NPPF) and is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area. The development plan for the area is the adopted Joint West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan. The neighbourhood plan should also contribute to sustainable development and be compatible with EU obligations including the SEA Directive of 2001/42/EC.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p>

			Monitoring	<p>Weymouth & Portland Borough Council has sought to actively engage with the Sutton Poyntz Society throughout the preparation of their Plan. The Council have responded to early drafts of the Plan with much of this advice having been taken on board. This representation therefore only contains commentary on the Plan where the Council considers outstanding issues remain.</p> <p>Weymouth & Portland Borough Council have been clear that with the recent decision to progress a new rural Dorset unitary authority and Weymouth Town Council for the Weymouth area, that from 1st April 2019 the planning powers granted to the designated Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Forum will pass to the newly formed Town Council. The recognition of this change within paragraph 1.7 of the draft Sutton Poyntz Plan is therefore welcomed.</p> <p>Although it is difficult to accurately calculate the stage the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan will have reached by the 1st April 2019 we would estimate that the Draft Plan could be submitted to Weymouth & Portland Borough Council in March 2019 and that the close of the six-week (Regulation 16) consultation would conclude in April 2019. The latter stages of plan making process would then need to be approved and undertaken by the new unitary council.</p> <p>It is hoped that early engagement with the shadow Weymouth Town Council will provide a steer in how they intend to use the draft Plan and its supporting evidence beyond that date. The Borough Council and new unitary council would be happy to assist both the outgoing Sutton Poyntz Society and incoming Weymouth Town Council through this transition period and discuss the options available to both parties at a meeting in early 2019.</p>	
			Plan Period	<p>Paragraph 14.4 - Agree with proposed Plan period until 2036 which mirrors the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan Review. The Plan period should also appear on the front cover.</p>	
			Presentation	<p>The plan should be set out in a clearer way. Each section should</p>	<p>We have already engaged with the shadow Town Clerk and, in particular, about the role and composition of a monitoring group.</p> <p>We have revised the draft plan to show the plan period on the front cover as you advised. We have also reworked the policy sections to discuss 'intent' before a</p>

			<p>Policy BNE1</p> <p>have a brief introduction followed by supporting text for the policy and then the policy itself. The supporting text needs to set out the reasons for the approach being taken with the policy being the tests that a decision maker will assess the requirements against. A process requirement (e.g. the need for a biodiversity appraisal) or action (e.g. to identify a local list of heritage assets) should not be included in policy.</p> <p>Guidance on ‘How to structure your neighbourhood plan’ prepared by Planning Aid England usefully discusses policy structure on page six.</p> <p>https://www.ourneighbourhoodplanning.org.uk/storage/resources/documents/How_to_structure_your_neighbourhood_plan.pdf</p> <p><i>Some parts of supporting text read as policy criteria. These should be placed within the policy and not within the supporting text. Examples are identified in the specific sections below.</i></p> <p><i>To aid navigation for the user it is suggested paragraph numbers are used throughout the document. Again, to aid navigation, it is general practice to provide numbers to all criteria beyond a single criterion. Policy BNE1, BNE2, BNE3, H&P1, H&P2, H&P3 and SR1 would benefit from additional numbering.</i></p> <p><i>Policy BNE1 has been prepared to be in general conformity with Adopted Local Plan strategic policies ENV2 and ENV3.</i></p> <p><i>Biodiversity Appraisals and Biodiversity Mitigation Plan</i></p> <p><i>It is noted that Biodiversity Appraisals and Biodiversity Mitigation Plans (BMP) are sought on all developments that directly adjoin the identified Green Corridors (Criterion 4) and that supporting text expands this requirement to Local Green Spaces where biodiversity was a reason for the designation.</i></p> <p><i>In contrast, the Councils existing ‘Planning Application Requirements’ (February 2016) seeks these assessments only on sites above 0.1ha in size and not currently used as existing residential or business premises. A BMP is also sought for any sized rural barn.</i></p>	<p>description of the actual policy. Finally, we have reviewed the text to ensure that the reasons for the particular approach being taken are clearer.</p> <p>Regarding policy BNE1, given the specific importance attached to the Green Corridor for biodiversity, we believe it is reasonable to provide enhanced protection from development proposals. However, to avoid over-complicating the existing process, we have reworded the final policy sentence to say, “All development proposals within the area defined as the Green Corridor, with the exception of existing residential or business premises but including any size rural barn, will be expected to include a Biodiversity</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Policy BNE2</p> <p>Policy BNE3</p>	<p><i>Although the supporting text to the Neighbourhood Plan policy provides a justification for these additional measures the Council is concerned that this policy requirement overly complicates an already established process. The harm judged by applications below 0.1ha or on existing residential or business premises is considered to be minimal and not significant enough to seek as standard a Biodiversity Appraisal or BMP. It is suggested this policy requirement should be removed from the Plan.</i></p> <p><i>Policy BNE2 has been prepared having regard to National Policy advice, principally the Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2018), Paragraphs 99-101.</i></p> <p><i>The supporting Independent Assessment of Candidate Site for Local Green Space Designation: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan (April 2018) is welcomed and justify the eleven listed designations. The designations are all close to the community served, demonstrably special and not vast tracks of land.</i></p> <p><i>The three listed exceptions for future development within the second criterion of the policy text are considered suitable for the status of this designation.</i></p> <p><i>Policy BNE3 has been prepared to be in general conformity with the strategic policies ENV2 & ENV10 of the adopted Local Plan.</i></p> <p><i>The Policy is supported by the Sutton Poyntz Place Appraisal which helpful outlines the distinctive character of village.</i></p> <p><i>The policy text recognises that situations will arise where there is no alternative to a loss of a tree and requires the tree to be replaced with an indigenous species of a type appropriate to that location. The policy would benefit from further clarification for scenarios where no replacement tree is appropriate? It would also be helpful to clarify the mechanism in which the replacement tree can be enforced. It is assumed through a condition to the planning application? This could be explained in the supporting text.</i></p>	<p>Appraisal and Biodiversity Mitigation Plan.”</p> <p>Regarding policy BNE3, dispensation against this provision should be given where it can be demonstrated that a replacement tree would be inappropriate. We have added a sentence on page 15, between current sentences 4 and 5, to the effect that “Enforcement of these provisions shall be through the inclusion of a condition to the planning consent.”</p>
--	--	--	---------------------------------------	---	--

			<p><i>Employment, Business & Tourism</i></p> <p><i>Policy GA1</i></p> <p><i>Policy GA2</i></p>	<p><i>It is noted that no specific policies have been drafted for employment, business and tourism applications but that instead community aspirations on this subject will be taken forward through the community aspirations listed in section 5.2.</i></p> <p><i>Policy GA1 has been prepared to be in general conformity with the strategic policies COM7 & ENV11 of the adopted Local Plan. It is thought that policy COM7 Creating a safe and efficient transport network better reflects the aspirations of the policy rather than policy COM9 which deals primarily with parking standards in new development.</i></p> <p><i>The introductory phrases “wherever practical” and “has the potential to” are not considered sufficiently precise and should be deleted. Using Policy COM7 as an example; the policy could simply apply to ‘development’ that generates additional traffic flows should...</i></p> <p><i>Although the aims of criteria GA1.1 and GA1.2 are supported they merely act as statements which cannot be measured. Criterion GA1.3 and GA1.4 would be considered too onerous on minor development. For example, the application of segregated space in criteria GA1.3 is limited by landownership. Criteria GA1.4 could only be applied where there are opportunities to connect to existing networks.</i></p> <p><i>We would suggest an alternative approach for this policy could be to identify specific routes and initiatives’ in the Plan and consider opportunities to fund those improvements through for example the neighbourhood plan proportion of Community Infrastructure Levy.</i></p> <p><i>Policy GA2 has been prepared to be in general conformity with adopted local plan strategic Policy COM9.</i></p> <p><i>Car Parking Provision</i></p> <p><i>Criteria GA2.1 states all new dwellings having two or more</i></p>	<p>Regarding policy GA1, we have deleted the introductory phrases as suggested. The first sentence now reads, “Any development that generates additional traffic flow should ...”</p> <p>We have retained 1.1 and 1.2 as statements of intent but have amended 1.3 to read, “Ensure that where included as part of the development, street lighting is of a suitable type and footways are so designed as to retain the character of the immediate surrounding area.”</p> <p>We have also modified 1.4 to reflect this, “Provide suitable access links to existing pedestrian and cycle routes where such opportunities exist.”</p> <p>The comments about policy GA2.1 are noted. We have reworded it as follows, “Development proposals that do not comply as a minimum with the off-street parking</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

bedrooms will incorporate a minimum of two off road parking spaces per dwelling and additional unallocated visitor space for each four homes (or part thereof).

Policy COM9 refers to the Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset Car Parking Study or its replacement. The study suggests for site capacity 5 or less units.

Table 1: Parking provision for developments of 5 dwellings or less	
Number of Bedrooms	Parking Spaces
1	1
2	1 or 2
3	2
4	2 or 3
Visitor parking: 1 visitor space will normally be required for these proposals.	

For sites of 6 units or more a locally responsive calculation is used requiring an online calculator.

The first concern is that the proposed Neighbourhood Plan criteria replicate a well understood and existing process. It is therefore suggested that this policy criteria is removed.

Should this route not be taken, we are concerned that there is insufficient justification to support deviation from current parking standards. Questions to consider;

- *What is the aim of the new policy? How does this compare with the aims of the Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset Car Parking Study?*
- *How does car parking in Sutton Poyntz compare with the wider Weymouth / Dorset context? Are there more or less spaces than any other areas?*
- *What are the implications of the policy on the local design character of the area? Incorporating two parking spaces per dwelling in such a historic area could appear out of*

criteria contained within the Bournemouth Poole and Dorset Car Parking Study will not be supported.”

			<p>character.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Will higher car parking standards simply encourage a higher car ownership?</i> <p><i>Should a policy be sufficiently justified, some further thought is required on the implications of the current wording.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The proposed criterion is silent on applications for single dwellings or single bedroom applications? Will the Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset Car Parking Study apply in these instances?</i> • <i>The proposed policy does not provide the same degree of variation for differing room sizes as set out in the Study. For example; a 2-bedroom dwellings should provide between 1-2 car parking spaces while a four-bedroom dwelling should supply between 2 or 3 spaces. The proposed policy instead sets a minimum figure with no upper limit.</i> • <i>Similarly, the proposed policy doesn't scale up well in terms of provide a mix of parking provisions in a larger scheme as set out in the Study calculator.</i> <p><i>Off Street Car Park</i></p> <p><i>It is understood that the majority of residents support a new car park but that it has not been possible to secure a viable location. Instead a general policy (GA2.3) has been drafted that limits the size of a new car park and ensures the proposal does not detract from the village character or impede traffic flow on adjoining roads.</i></p> <p>We cannot see where such a large car park can be justified or could be located without it impacting on the character or setting of the village. This must be carefully considered given that the village is attractive and lies within the AONB and Conservation Area and there are a number of listed buildings. A large area of hardstanding in the centre of the village is unlikely to preserve or enhance the</p>	<p>On the question of off-street car parking, we believe that there is no reason why a suitably designed car park cannot meet these criteria. Many similar facilities are sited within conservation and AONB designated areas. The policy recognises and accounts for the impact on the environment and character of the area.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p><i>Policy GA3</i></p>	<p>character of the village, the conservation area or the wider landscape of the AONB. We recommend the removal of reference to the provision of a new car park.</p> <p><i>Policy GA3 has been prepared to be in general conformity with adopted local plan strategic Policies ENV1 & COM7. It is thought that policy COM1 Making sure new development makes suitable provision for community infrastructure is relevant to this policy.</i></p> <p><i>Criterion GA3.1 prioritizes Community Infrastructure Levy receipts towards traffic calming measures in the vicinity of new development. Although a percentage of CIL receipts will be directed toward locally determined community projects, the impending formation of Weymouth Town Council may mean it is more appropriate to determine local prioritizes on a Weymouth wide basis.</i></p> <p>It should be note that many traffic matters fall outside the scope of planning; for example, changes to traffic management on existing transport networks are usually for the Highways Authority to deal with. Changes to traffic lights, speed limits, signage, and traffic circulation, crossing points and other traffic management devices usually fall outside the scope of Neighbourhood Plans. These restrictions do not however apply to the spending of CIL.</p> <p><i>Criterion GA3.2 seeks to “introduce measures to mitigate the post development erosion of infrastructure by larger vehicles and increasing traffic flow.” A general principle of planning is that future development can’t be required to mitigate existing issues. The general aim to support traffic mitigation schemes is however understood. Policy wording would benefit from being re-worded to better reflect these constraints and aid understanding for the reader. Suggested re-wording “Proposals for new or improved transport infrastructure will be supported”.</i></p>	<p>We have included additional wording to allow for a proportion of CIL to be directed towards traffic calming measures. This now reads, “A proportion of the Community Infrastructure Levy raised from new development shall be directed towards traffic calming and control measures.”</p> <p>We have amended the wording of policy GA3.2 as suggested.</p>
			<p><i>Policy GA4</i></p>	<p><i>Policy GA4 requires adequate charging facilities for ultra-low emission vehicles. Currently this requirement is not explicitly</i></p>	

			<p><i>supported by national planning policy. The Revised NPPF, Paragraph 108 does however support “appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes”.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, The Road to Zero Strategy (July 2018) states that “the houses we build in the coming years are electric vehicle ready. It is our intention that all new homes, where appropriate, should have a chargepoint available. We plan to consult as soon as possible on introducing a requirement for chargepoint infrastructure for new dwellings in England where appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>In advance of any change in National Planning Policy, the Council would be supportive of a policy that provided general support for charge points in new development.</i></p> <p><i>Policy HE1 has been prepared to be in general conformity with adopted local plan strategic Policy ENV4.</i></p> <p><i>The neighbourhood plan policy seeks an archaeological assessment on all previously developed land. The adopted Local Plan Policy ENV4 and supporting Planning Applications Requirements seek an archaeological assessment from applications affecting sites of archeologically importance and where necessary a field evaluation. Paragraph 2.3.8 of the local plan states “This may be required in areas of archaeological potential.”</i></p> <p><i>The first concern is that this approach replicates a well understood approach to archaeological assessment.</i></p> <p><i>If it is accepted that the whole Neighbourhood Plan area is of high archaeological interest to warrant a specific policy, it would be useful to understand why only brownfield sites are expected to undertake assessment work and not equally greenfield development?</i></p>	
		Policy HE1		<p>We understand that your comments about Policy HE1 were based on a misunderstanding. We have therefore left the wording unchanged.</p>
		Policy HE2	<p><i>Policy HE2 has been prepared to be in general conformity with adopted local plan strategic Policy ENV4.</i></p> <p><i>The policy seeks to protect locally listed heritage assets and is supported by the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Heritage Assessment (October 2018) which assesses 12 existing designations</i></p>	<p>We acknowledge your comments about policy HE2. This has now been replaced by a community aspiration (with some additional explanatory text in Section 4.4). We have also included a map of the Conservation</p>

			<p><i>and 24 non-designated heritage assets. The second paragraph of the policy suggests a local list of assets will be developed. As this is an 'action' it should be removed from policy. For any locally important heritage assets to be protected they need to be listed, evidenced and mapped.</i></p> <p><i>Policy H&P1 has been prepared to be in general conformity with adopted local plan strategic Policy ENV1 & ENV12. Policy ENV10 the landscape and townscape setting are also considered relevant. The first criterion pursues the preservation and enhancement of the Conservation Area taking into account traditional building styles. To aid understanding for the reader it would be helpful to include a map of the Conservation Area within the Plan so that the extent of the Policy is known without the need to reference other documents. As the remainder of the policy and supporting text appear to refer to character areas that cover the whole designated Neighbourhood Plan Area it is suggested that this first paragraph could be expanded to refer to all development and not simply development in the Conservation area, unless the intention was to only apply this policy within the Conservation Area? The second criterion seeks new development to take account of nearby building styles and materials within five character areas defined with the supporting Place Appraisal. The policy helpfully lists the areas with an accompanying map (M-PAC1) and cross refers to further guidance within the Place Appraisal. The third criterion refers to the Dorset AONB and broadly conforms to the broad objective of Local Plan Policy ENV1 however we would question what additional value the criterion adds beyond Policy ENV1? The final criterion supports development which enhances the village in locations where the building style has not been complementary to traditional styles. This criterion strikes a careful</i></p>	<p>area.</p> <p>Regarding H&P1, we have revised the wording in line with your comments.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p><i>balance between reflecting on past mistakes without identifying individual properties. The supporting text goes much further in providing examples. The Policy text would benefit from further reference to the Place Appraisal that discusses design issues in more detail. It is noted that there is some overlap with the objectives of the second criterion which perhaps better articulate the plans policy intention towards building style and design. Supporting text should be re-ordered to reflect the order of subjects discussed in the Policy or vice-versa. For example, the Conservation Area is discussed in the supporting text under Design Guidance while in the policy it is the first Criterion. The use of more sub-headings may help here to add clarity for the decision taker and for applicants.</i></p> <p>There is considered a conflict within the supporting text between traditional and innovative design. The supporting text firstly seeks not to prevent or discourage “appropriate innovation or change” however later on states that “Where surrounding houses are not of traditional or sympathetic design, they should reflect the older properties in the Historic Core”. This seems to prevent any contemporary style design and would only permit traditional styles which seem to contradict the earlier point. It is suggested that it would be more appropriate to remove the reference to the historic core and reference locally specific design characteristics and criteria.</p> <p><i>Policy H&P2 has been prepared to be in general conformity with adopted local plan strategic Policy SUS2 & HOUS3. The proposed policy largely replicates Policy SUS2, criterion two and Policy HOUS3. We would therefore question what added value the policy as drafted provides?</i></p> <p><i>The fourth paragraph of the supporting text does however add additional local context by supporting “new housing involving the replacement of existing dwellings to provide smaller scale housing,</i></p>	<p>We have reviewed policy H&P2 in line with your comments.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>Policy H&P3</p>	<p><i>if necessary, at a higher density". This aspiration reflects Local Plan policy ENV15 and should be converted into a policy criterion. The supporting text continues that "houses of a higher specification suitable as retirement homes that will encourage residents to downsize releasing larger homes for families" would also be supported. Reference to support for 'higher specifications' should be included in policy text.</i></p> <p><i>Policy H&P3 has been prepared to be in general conformity with adopted local plan strategic Policy ENV1. The policy lists 7 key views that have been identified through Independent Assessment of Candidate locations for Key views designation: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan (April 2018). This report is usefully cross referenced in the supporting text. Although the study originally identified 15 key views these have been reduced to seven reflecting only the most iconic. The key views are helpfully mapped (M-HP3), photographed and described.</i></p> <p>The extents of each view need to be clearly described i.e. from point A to point B. These also need to be clearly shown on a map and not be extensive. We particularly have an issue with Views 4, 5, 6 and 7 which are considered extensive.</p>	<p>We have revised the key views (H&P3), providing more precise splays.</p>
			<p>Policy H&P4</p>	<p><i>Policy H&P4 has been prepared to be in general conformity with adopted local plan strategic Policy ENV5. Reference to NPPF paragraph numbers requires updating to reflect the Revised NPPF (July 2018).</i></p> <p><i>Criteria 4.1 of the policy supports development which makes use of porous surfaces and demonstrate that the volume of surface water run-off onto adjacent land and roads is either at a lower or equal level than prior to development.</i></p> <p><i>Criteria 4.2 requests information that explains how surface water run-off will be reduced or mitigated. The supporting text confirms the intention to apply the policy to all development.</i></p> <p><i>Government guidance is already in place that explains that you will</i></p>	<p>Regarding policy H&P4, and flood risk, we would argue that further justification is based upon the higher than average number of properties with long wide driveways, particularly to the north of the Environment Agency Zone 3 (high risk) flood area. This is accentuated by the higher than average level of multiple vehicle ownership and consequent hardstanding demand and the location of these properties on a steep gradient which also receives a flow of surface water from natural spring sources in the surrounding hills. We have amended</p>

			<p>not need planning permission if a new or replacement driveway of any size uses permeable (or porous) surfacing which allows water to drain through, such as gravel, permeable concrete block paving or porous asphalt, or if the rainwater is directed to a lawn or border to drain naturally.</p> <p>If the surface to be covered is more than five square metres planning permission will be needed for laying traditional, impermeable driveways that do not provide for the water to run to a permeable area.</p> <p>https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7728/pavingfrontgardens.pdf</p> <p><i>If the intention is simply to replicate this existing requirement it is suggested that this criterion can be deleted however if the group are looking to apply this requirement more widely a policy could be taken forward.</i></p> <p><i>To justify a new policy the Plan must demonstrate why the situation is different to other areas? Although it is acknowledged there is some local justification for a flood prevention policy, this must be balanced against a need not to overly burden development and officer time requesting this information disproportionately.</i></p> <p><i>It is suggested that the policy wording could be strengthened to make the policy into a 'requirement' rather than simply to 'support' new development that makes substantive use of porous surfaces. The phrase 'substantive' would benefit from further clarification in the supporting text.</i></p> <p><i>The second criterion H&P4.2 supports the first criteria by requests additional information from applicants to explain how surface water run-off will be reduced or mitigated. As a 'process requirement' this text should be located in the supporting text.</i></p> <p><i>Policy SR1 has been prepared to be in general conformity with adopted local plan strategic Policy COM2 & COM3.</i></p>	<p>H&P 4.2 as suggested.</p>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

				<p>directing new development towards the existing urban area. Natural England, Historic England, and the Environment Agency were consulted on the SEA screening, in accordance with regulation 9(2) of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. Historic England and the Environment Agency responded to the consultation and agreed with the conclusion that the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood is unlikely to have significant environment effects.</p> <p><u>Other Supporting Documents</u></p> <p>Although not required for this stage it will be expected that the final submission plan will be accompanied by a 'Basic Conditions Statement' and 'Consultation Statement'.</p>	<p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
18	21/12/2018	Resident	<p>Housing and Planning Section 4.5 "Introduction" 4th paragraph</p> <p>Key Views Map M-HP3</p>	<p>The NHP will be used by speculative developers looking for opportunities. The plan should not be misleading nor capable of being used to mislead. The paragraph commencing "The possibility of small scale ..." can be misinterpreted. It relates to rural and affordable housing. Sutton Poyntz has no demand for either. In planning terms Sutton Poyntz is not sustainable (reference 34). Dorset County Council advice is that the NHP is not required to say anything about affordable housing. I suggest the paragraph be removed.</p> <p>On the map the blue cone for view 5 is too narrow. It does not reflect the breadth of the view from the "Beacon". There used to be an important view – the reciprocal of view 5 – from the field gate at the junction of Plaisters Lane and the disused footpath. This view has recently been blocked by a large steel</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>Regarding section 4.5. It is the Steering Group's view that an exception site would only be possible if need could be demonstrated. We have revised the wording to make this clear.</p> <p>We have reviewed the view splays (Map M-HP3) but have narrowed them in light of the Local Authority's concerns that they were too wide and too imprecise. Regarding the view from Plaisters Lane, this was</p>

				<p>sheet. The NHP could well record that for many tens of years there was an important view now (temporarily) blocked by an unusual solid steel sheet.</p>	<p>considered but rejected by the independent assessor.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
19	21/12/2018	Residents	Housing	<p>Thank you for this detailed and well-prepared plan. We enjoy this village, its character and its views. For this reason, we would be against any additional development outside the existing defined development boundary.</p> <p>We are also concerned that any such additional housing will lead to more cars on the road, and increase the existing hazard of Sutton Road traffic. However, we do agree that more smaller houses should be permitted within this development area., because of the housing need.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
20	21/12/2018	Residents	Policy H&P 2	<p>The plan provides for 20 new houses without indicating where these could be built. Recent developments like Sutton Gate (two of which remain unsold) have resulted in too many houses being built on a small site with inadequate parking and negative impact on the street scene.</p> <p>To provide sufficient building plots to meet the housing proposals</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>The Steering Group did discuss the feasibility</p>

			<p>in the plan the obvious solution would be to make small adjustments to the development boundary. A precedent has already been set for such changes with planning permission being granted for building outside the existing boundary. It must be remembered that the development boundary which was arbitrarily fixed can be adjusted.</p>	<p>of building 20 new homes within the defined development boundary (DDB). The conclusion was that this was going to be difficult, but not impossible. Although the Stage 2 Survey had shown that the majority opinion in the village was against a change in the DDB, it was decided that the rate of growth should be monitored with a view to recommending changes should the number of new homes fall below the anticipated rate. It should be noted that three new dwellings are likely to be built within the village this year (FY18/19), on top of four new dwellings completed in FY 17/18.</p>
		Section 4.5 Housing and Planning	<p>There does not seem to be any proposal in this section for the provision of affordable homes for local families or suitable ones for older people already living in Sutton Poyntz who wish to downsize.</p>	<p>The draft plan acknowledges rural exception sites (page 25 H&P introduction paragraph 4) and is certainly not against affordable housing. Although sites have not been allocated, the plan does not seek to restrict such allocations.</p>
		Other comments:	<p>We question whether this costly neighbourhood plan should have gone ahead when it has upset so many people and covers such a tiny area of Weymouth.</p>	<p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>

21	22/12/2018	<p>David Stuart Historic Places Adviser South West</p> <p>Direct Line: 0117 975 0680 Mobile: 0797 924 0316</p> <p>Historic England 29 Queen Square Bristol BS1 4ND</p> <p>https://historicengland.org.uk/southwest</p>		<p>Thank you for your Regulation 14 consultation on the pre-submission version of the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>This is our first involvement in the preparation of your Plan since we offered generic advice at the time of the area's designation in the spring of 2017.</p> <p>We are impressed with the progress which the Group has made in the preparation of the Plan over what, in our experience of these exercises, is quite a short period of time. We are also impressed by the degree to which your community has sought to understand and value the distinctive qualities of the Plan area, especially those relating to its historic character.</p> <p>In particular we commend the process of carrying out a Place Appraisal and using this to inform specific themes and policy aspirations within the Plan. In this respect, policies HE1, HE2, H&P1, and H&P3 are clear and positive examples of how such an exercise can ensure the protection and enhancement of the historic environment and guide future change to that end.</p> <p>Otherwise, there are no specific comments we would want to make on the Plan other than to congratulate your community on its progress to date and wish it well in the making of the Plan.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>Based on other feedback, we have replaced policy HE2 by a community aspiration.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
22	22/12/2018	<p>Paul Emms, Gladman Developments Ltd., Gladman House, Alexandria Way, Congleton Business Park, Congleton,</p>		<p>This letter provides Gladman Developments Ltd (Gladman) representations in response to the draft version of the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan (SPNP) under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. This letter seeks to highlight the issues with the plan as currently presented and its relationship with national and local planning policy. Gladman has considerable experience in neighbourhood planning, having been involved in the process during the preparation of numerous plans across the country, it is from this experience that</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p>

		<p>Cheshire. CW12 1LB 01260 288800 www.gladman.co.uk</p>	<p>these representations are prepared.</p> <p>Legal Requirements</p> <p>Before a neighbourhood plan can proceed to referendum it must be tested against a set of basic conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The basic conditions that the SPNP must meet are as follows:</p> <p>(a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order.</p> <p>(d) The making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>(e) The making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).</p> <p>(f) The making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.</p> <p>Revised National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>On the 24th July 2018, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government published the revised National Planning Policy Framework. The first revision since 2012, it implements 85 reforms announced previously through the Housing White Paper. Paragraph 214 of the revised Framework makes clear that the policies of the previous Framework will apply for the purpose of examining plans where they are submitted on or before 24th January 2019. Given the date of this consultation, the comments below reflect the relationship between Neighbourhood Plans and the National Planning Policy Framework adopted in 2012.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. In doing so it sets out the requirements for the preparation of neighbourhood plans to be in conformity with the strategic priorities for the wider area and the role in which they play in delivering sustainable development to meet development needs.</p> <p>At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread through both plan-making and decision-taking. For plan-making this means that plan makers should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. This requirement is applicable to neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>The recent Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) updates make clear that neighbourhood plans should conform to national policy requirements and take account the latest and most up-to-date evidence of housing needs in order to assist the Council in delivering sustainable development, a neighbourhood plan basic condition.</p> <p>The application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development will have implications for how communities engage with neighbourhood planning. Paragraph 16 of the Framework makes clear that Qualifying Bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should develop plans that support strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing development and plan positively to support local development.</p> <p>Paragraph 17 further makes clear that neighbourhood plans should set out a clear and positive vision for the future of the area and policies contained in those plans should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Neighbourhood plans should seek to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, jobs and thriving local places that the country needs, whilst responding positively to the wider opportunities for growth.</p> <p>Paragraph 184 of the Framework makes clear that local planning authorities will need to clearly set out their strategic policies to ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. The Neighbourhood Plan should ensure that it is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area and plan positively to support the delivery of sustainable growth opportunities.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance</p> <p>It is clear from the requirements of the Framework that neighbourhood plans should be prepared in conformity with the strategic requirements for the wider area as confirmed in an adopted development plan. The requirements of the Framework have now been supplemented by the publication of Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).</p> <p>On 11th February 2016, the Secretary of State (SoS) published a series of updates to the neighbourhood planning chapter of the PPG. In summary, these update a number of component parts of the evidence base that are required to support an emerging neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>On 19th May 2016, the Secretary of State published a further set of updates to the neighbourhood planning PPG.</p> <p>These updates provide further clarity on what measures a qualifying body should take to review the contents of a neighbourhood plan where the evidence base for the plan policy becomes less robust. As such it is considered that where a qualifying body intends to undertake a review of the neighbourhood plan, it should include a policy relating to this intention which includes a detailed explanation</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>outlining the qualifying bodies anticipated timescales in this regard.</p> <p>Further, the PPG makes clear that neighbourhood plans should not contain policies restricting housing development in settlements or preventing other settlements from being expanded. It is with that in mind that Gladman has reservations regarding the SPNP’s ability to meet basic condition (a) and this will be discussed in greater detail throughout this response.</p> <p>Relationship to Local Plan</p> <p>To meet the requirements of the Framework and the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions, neighbourhood plans should be prepared to conform to the strategic policy requirements set out in the adopted Development Plan. The adopted Development Plan relevant to the preparation of the SPNP is the West Dorset and Weymouth and Portland Joint Local Plan 2011-2031 (now extended to 2036), adopted 2015.</p> <p>West Dorset District Council are again working with Weymouth & Portland Borough Council to review their recently adopted Joint Local Plan (2015) as recommended by the Local Plan Inspector in his report on the local plan examination. Having consulted on Issues and Options (Reg 18) in early 2017, Preferred Options consultation closed October 2018. The Town Council should be mindful of this document as it emerges and draft the policies within the SPNP as flexibly as possible to minimise any potential conflicts with the emerging Joint Local Plan.</p> <p>The housing requirement in the Joint Local Plan will be based upon the new standardized methodology for calculating local housing needs however, this methodology is yet to be finalised following publication of the revised NPPF. The Government has stated it will consider adjusting the methodology, following publication of the</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>household projections published in September 2018, to be consistent with ensuring that 300,000 homes are built per year by the mid-2020s. It is not known what impact this will have for the future housing requirement in the Joint Local Plan, but this will almost certainly be higher than the figure proposed in the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for the District.</p> <p>The emerging Joint Local Plan Review proposes to designate Sutton Poyntz as a 3rd Tier Settlement with a 'Defined Settlement Boundary', a tool for 'normally permitting' development within and 'strictly controlling' development outside. It should be noted however that, "in preparing neighbour-hood development plans local communities can propose amendments to these DDBs, provided that this would not promote less development than is set out in the local plan" (para 3.4.13 of Local Plan Review). The level of growth that these settlements are required to deliver is yet to be finalised and as such the SPNP should be as flexible as possible regarding the level of development proposed.</p> <p>Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>This section highlights the key issues that Gladman would like to raise with regards to the content of the SPNP as currently proposed. It is considered that some policies do not reflect the requirements of national policy and guidance, Gladman have therefore sought to recommend a series of modifications to the plan to ensure compliance with the basic conditions.</p> <p>Whilst Gladman note the housing mix proposed through this policy it should be recognised that housing needs do change over time. We would suggest wording is added to the policy to allow flexibility to account for these changing needs. Gladman suggest adding the wording 'This should be evidenced through an up to date assessment' to this policy.</p> <p>Policy H&P2 – Housing</p> <p>Policy H&P2 also refers to the 'defined settlement boundary'. Gladman would object to the use of settlement limits if these</p>	<p>We recognise that needs change over time which is why we are looking at a monitoring process to ensure that the plan is appropriate for the village over the next 20 years.</p> <p>The plan is not against affordable housing and recognises rural exception sites.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Numbers and Size</p> <p>would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Framework is clear that development which is sustainable should go ahead. The use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements would not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework. Whilst mindful of the AONB, Gladman submit that this policy should be drafted more flexibly with demonstrably sustainable development adjacent to the settlement boundary also supported, bearing in mind paragraph 3.4.13 of Local Plan Review noted above.</p> <p>Policy H&P3 – Key Views</p> <p>Identified views must ensure that they demonstrate a physical attribute elevating a views importance beyond simply being a nice view of open countryside.</p> <p>Policy BNE2 – Local Green Spaces</p> <p>This policy seeks to designate sites as Local Green Space (LGS). Paragraph 76 of the Framework sets out the role of local communities seeking to designate land as LGS and makes clear that this designation should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development in the wider area. It states that: <i>“Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. Identifying land as Local Green Space should therefore be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.”</i> Further guidance is provided at paragraph 77, which sets out three tests which must be met for the designation of LGS. It states that: <i>“The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The</i></p>	<p>Although sites have not been allocated in the plan, it does not seek to restrict such allocations.</p> <p>Regarding key views, we have amended the splays to be more precise, following feedback from the Local Authority.</p> <p>Please be reassured that proposed Local Green Spaces have been assessed (Ref 37) against the NPPF criteria.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p><i>designation should only be used:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; - where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquility or richness of its wildlife; and - Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.” <p>Taking the requirements of the Framework and PPG into account, it is essential that when allocating LGS, plan makers can clearly demonstrate that the requirements for its allocation are met in full and that they are capable of enduring over the plan period and beyond. Whilst the aspirations of the proposed LGS are noted, Gladman would ensure any evidence behind the proposed LGS designations (43), meets all the tests of national policy.</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>Gladman recognises the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance that these must be consistent with national planning policy and the strategic requirements for the wider authority area. Through this consultation response, Gladman has sought to clarify the relation of the SPNP as currently proposed with the requirements of national planning policy and the strategic policies for the wider area. Gladman is concerned that the plan in its current form does not comply with basic condition (a). The plan does not conform with national policy and guidance. Gladman hopes you have found these representations helpful and constructive. If you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me or one of the Gladman team.</p>	<p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>	
23	23/12/2018	Resident	Section 1.3	<p>We ought perhaps to note here that a small part of the village is in</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response</p>

				<p>West Dorset, and that technical reasons in the Localism Act prevent these houses from being part of the Neighbourhood Area (although they have been included in all consultations).</p>	<p>to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group. We will make it clear that a small part of the village lies outside the Neighbourhood Area.</p>
			Policy BNE2	<p>The URL for Reference 44 does not work, but the document I think it refers to does not discuss Local Green Space designation or anything similar. Reference 45 discusses the impact on house prices of having green space next door, and Reference 46 looks at the wider economic benefits of having green space; neither of them looks in any way at the impact of Local Green Space designation.</p>	<p>Thank you for the feedback regarding policy BNE 2. Since the impact on land and property values is not a determining factor for LGS designation we have deleted all three references.</p>
			Policy GA1	<p>Worthy aspiration, but as written is any of it (with the single exception of street lighting) actually practical. This tries to place responsibilities on individual developers that belong more properly to planners. The policy includes the words "wherever practical" and I would argue that these responsibilities will never be practical.</p>	<p>We have rewritten policy GA1 to improve the wording.</p>
			Policy GA3	<p>In the Stage 2 Survey, the village was pretty unconvinced about traffic calming measures, apart from the bend before Wyndings. I think we may have created a policy where there is no demand.</p>	
			Page 25	<p>It's not quite correct to say, "the village is covered in its entirety by a conservation area", as the houses at the top of Plaisters Lane are outside.</p>	
			Page 25	<p>In the Stage 2 Survey, the village was opposed to HOUS2-type exception sites. The paragraph on this is not well matched to the village's views and is in any case not necessary as it merely states what is already policy.</p>	<p>Regarding exception sites, we have received both critical and supportive comments on this paragraph. In the absence of a call for sites, or support for a review of the defined</p>

			<p>Policy H&P1</p> <p>Policy H&P3</p> <p>Aspiration AP 5.6.1</p>	<p>I would advocate adding a sentence about non-traditional design and materials, perhaps to the effect that such developments will be welcomed where the developer can show convincingly how the design complements and is in sympathy with its surroundings. We could perhaps also say "particularly where the design and materials can be shown to benefit sustainability".</p> <p>The view from Plaisters Lane to the east from opposite Sutton Close has been regarded by the village as important for as long as such things have been documented. The consultants were not aware of the documentary history that demonstrates that. I strongly advocate that this view should be added to the list so that when this land is eventually developed, a view from Plaisters Lane is preserved.</p> <p>Assets of Community Value must have a current primary use that "furthers the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community" (Localism Act 2011). There is no way that the bit of private garden in front of 97 Sutton Road can satisfy that requirement.</p>	<p>development boundary, this statement is an important indicator of the community's wish to play its part in meeting local and national housing needs.</p> <p>You make an important point about policy H&P1. The wording has been changed to be less prescriptive.</p> <p>Regarding the potential key view from Plaisters Lane, we commissioned an independent survey of Key Views and this particular view was considered and rejected by the assessor.</p> <p>We have removed the area in front of 97 Sutton Road from the proposed list of assets of community value, although it should be noted that this location has been important in the past for the Sutton Poyntz Victorian Street Fayre.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents
24	23/12/2018	Resident		<p>After reading the draft proposal for the neighbourhood plan, I have a few points that I would like to comment on;</p> <p><u>Provision and facilities to attract young people to live in the Village.</u></p> <p>It is with some amazement that the proposals are only in favour of 1 new home per year being built over the next twenty years, although “if necessary, at higher density will be supported, as will houses of a higher specification suitable as retirement homes that will encourage residents to downsize releasing larger homes for families”. This Village is fast becoming an open plan retirement Village inhabited by an ageing population of mainly affluent retired professionals. If young families could afford the larger houses that the present residents are downsizing from then they would clearly be moving into the Village already as these homes currently become available. What this Village needs is some affordable housing, social housing or housing schemes such as shared ownership enabling young families on an average wage to afford to live here. Your proposal states that we live in a vibrant village, it was very much more vibrant when we had tied cottages, linked to the two farms that used to be in the Village, allowing all classes of people to live here and not just the retired, or more affluent individuals.</p> <p>The suggestion of using the Springhead play area as a facility for</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>The Steering Group did discuss the feasibility of building 20 new homes within the defined development boundary (DDB). The conclusion was that this was going to be difficult, but not impossible. Although the Stage 2 Survey had shown that the majority opinion in the village was against a change in the DDB, it was decided that the rate of growth should be monitored with a view to recommending changes should the number of new homes fall below the anticipated rate. It should be noted that three new dwellings are likely to be built within the village this year (FY18/19), on top of four new dwellings completed in FY 17/18.</p> <p>We have stated that the plan acknowledges rural exception sites (H&P introduction para 4). The plan is not against affordable housing. Sites have not been allocated, but the plan does not seek to restrict such allocations. Regarding young families, we would note that there are at least 40 young people currently living in the village.</p>

			<p>local children is a very poor suggestion as it provides a “quick fix” to almost dismiss the question of a permanent play area. The Springhead is a private business and would have to satisfy several issues with regard to insurance, accountability and management. Has anyone actually asked the owners of the Springhead for their views? What about trying to incorporate some purpose-built business units into the plan to allow the people that live in the Village to also be able to work in it.</p> <p>The housing issue seems to be more about what the Village does not want more than what it really needs to be able to sustain and attract a new and younger generation of Villagers.</p> <p><u>Greenspace</u></p> <p>I feel that I must again take up issue with regards to my land labelled by you as “Puddledock Allotments” being designated as green space. As far as I can deduct from my research, Greenspace, or Green space, within a neighbourhood plan normally refers to green vegetated areas that are used by or are important to the public, such as parks, formal public gardens and areas of recreation such as sports areas and public allotments. My land does not fall into any of these categories as it is a private garden, not open to the public, locked and fenced and used by my Wife and I, and only by us for our exclusive private use.</p> <p>I notice that on page 14 there are four criteria that are listed to support your argument and they are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.beauty 2.Wildlife 3.Recreation 4.Historic <p>I note that all except category 1 are listed as being relevant and are marked “yes” in your table of reasons for designation. I dispute your findings for the following reasons:</p>	<p>Please be assured that the criteria employed to identify potential Local Green Spaces were professionally and independently assessed.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p><u>Category 2 Wildlife</u></p> <p>Whilst I acknowledge that our land hosts a variety of bird species which we go to great lengths to attract, some statements in your independent assessment are inaccurate and misleading. It is possible that bats and “breeding woodpeckers” frequent our land, as they probably do in most other gardens and open spaces in the village. All birds breed in the summer and so it is, in my opinion, that to try and enhance the findings the word “breeding” has been carefully added to somehow make the presence of woodpeckers more significant and give the impression that they are breeding in our garden. I can confirm that there are not, and have not ever been, woodpeckers breeding on my land. We positively discourage woodpeckers from our garden as they damage our nest boxes and destroy our beehives. We also take great steps to discourage, control and eradicate vermin such as squirrels, Rats, Moles and Corvids with some degree of success. We have erected suitable fencing around the whole perimeter of the garden to stop Deer from eating our crops and from Foxes and Badgers from attacking our Chickens. It is therefore very difficult and almost impossible for wildlife, except for airborne species, to transit freely through our garden and access other potential habitats. Which does not give the statement mentioned on page 14 of the draft validity for our land, “A primary purpose for many of the designated local green spaces is to secure a buffer zone along the green corridor as it passes through developed areas to allow wildlife to move freely along the corridor and provide connectivity to potential habitat in adjacent areas”.</p> <p>Page 48 of the draft plan also shows that we have grass snakes and slow worms on our property, we acknowledge that slow worms are sometimes seen in the summer and have also seen the chickens devour them, so unfortunately it is not always a safe environment for small animals as we are committed to free-ranging our Chickens. I have never seen a grass snake in the garden</p>	<p>We are grateful for confirmation of those species you believe to be present. Whilst we are aware that other birds, as well as Woodpeckers, breed in the immediate area, we agree that the term breeding should hold no additional significance in respect of Woodpeckers. As you correctly observe, airborne species such as birds and bats will freely transit the area (as it provides hedgerow corridors and winter feed on fallen fruit and seeded vegetables and flowers). The adjacent River Jordan also provides habitat for a range of invertebrates and aquatic species (including European Eel) and small mammals which will freely transit this environment along with the herptiles you mention.</p> <p>The map to which you refer relates to species which have been reported in that general area due to the limitations of scale. However, all are marked within less than 100 metres of their reported location.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>in the 25 years that I have lived here and would be interested to know your source of information.</p> <p><u>Category 3 Recreation</u> Our land, although used for horticultural purposes, has never been allotments. It is not open to the public and has always been in private ownership with the first record of the land being used as additional garden by residents of Puddledock Cottages from 1952 (from a first-hand conversation between Simon Grant-Jones and Herbie Morris, late of 3 Puddledock cottages). When we acquired the land in 2012, we allowed existing plot holders to carry on under our tenure with new written agreements. The plots have never been referred to as “allotments”.</p> <p>I can confirm that rather than have the steering committee label us as “a community recreational facility” which could have implications on how we are able to use the land in the future, we have terminated our agreements with existing plot holders and as from 31st December 2018 there will be no one else other than my Wife and I who will have access to the garden. Therefore, the recreational value to the local community no longer exists and we request that it be disregarded from your list of criteria.</p> <p><u>Category 4 Historic</u> What is Historic about a piece of land that once formed part of a farm and is now used as a garden. To my knowledge there are no great historic occurrences that have taken place here, no great battles, no public hangings, no historic buildings, just a former flood plain that has been brought to life by cultivation in the past 60 to 80 years. The farm buildings and yard (with the exception of the Dairy House, Sutton House and Puddledock Cottages) have all been razed to the ground and re-built as modern housing, although these remaining original properties have been extensively altered, added to and modernized. Modern housing has also been</p>	<p>Thank you for confirmation that the land has and continues to be used for horticultural purposes. The area is known locally as ‘allotments’ and public identification of the location was the purpose of this description. Please note that we have labelled the area in the table on page 14 (“Puddledock Allotments/Herbies Garden) following earlier consultative feedback. The area (G9) has been used prior to, and during, the current ownership for horticultural purposes, specifically the growing of fruit, vegetables and flowers by plot holders.</p> <p>Puddledock Lane is one of the important lanes upon which the historic village core is built and has a long history associated with the development of Sutton Farm. The area in question has been used for horticulture for several centuries (as evidenced by the Weld Estate Maps (circa 1791), Tithe Map (1838) and 19th / 20th century Ordnance survey maps.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>built along the length of Puddledock lane from the East end to Puddledock Cottages. We would be very interested to know how our garden contributes to the “Historic setting” of Puddledock Lane when so much of the real History has been erased in fairly recent times.</p> <p>The first that I knew of our land being put forward for designation as Greenspace was when I opened the stage two survey questionnaire that was sent to me in December 2017. Neither my Wife or I was consulted prior to this and to the best of our knowledge other landowners were also kept in the dark over your proposals until they emerged in the document. If we were consulted, we would have told you then that we have no intention to try to develop the land and, in our opinion, our land has ample protection from development, it is in an area of outstanding natural beauty, it is outside of the development boundary and more importantly we are inside a conservation area and we can prove that none of the criteria for listing can be overwhelmingly satisfied. We believe that our land will be de-valued if it becomes greenspace and if we can be proved right, we will be looking to be compensated for our loss should your proposals go ahead.</p> <p><u>Management and monitoring</u></p> <p>I strongly believe that the neighbourhood plan should be monitored and managed by the new unitary authority and not the Sutton Poyntz society or any form of the neighbourhood plan steering group or any future incarnation of that group. My Wife and I have already experienced poor communication, undemocratic decisions, lack of consultation with affected landowners and positive constructive exclusion of residents with regard to consultation meetings held at very short notice and within working hours where Villagers who work were unable to get time off at short notice and therefore get the chance to question any findings. We were also not given the opportunity to question</p>	<p>We understand your concern about the Stage Two Survey, but this was a wide-ranging consultation document supplied to all stakeholders.</p> <p>We can reassure you that there is no requirement for, nor right of, public access to land designated as a Local Green Space. The proposed Local Green Space protection aims to strengthen the existing protections and extend them to wildlife, recreation and historic aspects. The independent professional report explains this in more detail (Ref 37). The presence of ‘allotments’ does not diminish, or in any way interfere with, your rights as the landowner.</p> <p>Regarding the monitoring role, we have initiated discussions with the shadow Town Clerk on a future monitoring strategy, as reflected at Sect 1 of the draft plan. These discussions are on-going.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>Brian Wilson, the independent consultant who looked at and assessed the criteria for greenspaces.</p> <p>The Sutton Poyntz Society is not an organisation of professional town planners but an organisation of self-appointed people who think that their views represent the majority in the Village. They are not an authority on planning matters and have recently issued a statement to say that they will no longer give advice on planning matters within the Village. Why this statement has been made is not clear as no explanation was given and perhaps a statement to qualify why this decision was made should be made available so that we can all see why they feel the need to distance themselves from giving planning advice after doing so over a long period of time.</p>	<p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
25	23/12/2018	Stakeholder/Resident/Local business	General Process	<p>The preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan by volunteers has clearly proved a time consuming and complex business, with the gathering of evidence, engagement with stakeholders and preparation of documents. It is appreciated that the volunteers are seeking what is best for the village and have worked hard to produce the draft Neighbourhood Plan. However, I have followed the process carefully and wish to raise serious concerns about shortcomings in the approach and decisions taken forward.</p> <p>My concerns commenced with the publication of the Stage 2 Survey in advance of discussions with landowners. This meant that proposals affecting landowners were put forward before they had been informed e.g. location of key views, green spaces and local listing. However, my main objection to the questionnaire is that it was not supported properly with information about the need for sustainable development. Residents are often resistant to change and when presented with a question about how much housing is required (Q14) will suggest as few as possible, with little consideration of needs. Residents should be made aware of these needs to allow them to make informed responses.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans are supposed to provide opportunities for</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>The objective of putting proposals forward prior to formal consultation with landowners was to ascertain the general level of support by all stakeholders before pursuing these options.</p>

			<p>communities to positively plan to deliver sustainable development. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that: <i>“There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;</i> • <i>a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and</i> • <i>an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.”</i> <p>The above makes it clear that sustainable development is not simply about protecting the environment, or public transport, but is a balance between economic, social and environmental factors. Neither one is considered to take precedence without justification. The NPPF also sets out a ‘<i>presumption in favour of sustainable development</i>’, that both Local and Neighbourhood Plans should reflect, which states:</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p><i>“For plan-making this means that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area;</i> • <i>Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or</i> ○ <i>specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.”</i> <p>This clearly sets out that plans should seek to meet objectively assessed needs. It is therefore important for a plan to be properly informed by the evidence of these needs. Paragraph 16 of the NPPF goes on to say:</p> <p><i>“The application of the presumption will have implications for how communities engage in neighbourhood planning. Critically, it will mean that neighbourhoods should:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>develop plans that support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing and economic development;</i> • <i>plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside the strategic elements of the Local Plan.”</i> <p>The Adopted West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan confirms the presumption in favour of sustainable development within its first and overriding policy. The NPPF further states at Paragraph 184, that when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan:</p> <p><i>“The ambition of the neighbourhood should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area. Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the</i></p> 	
--	--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Vision and Objectives</p>	<p><i>strategic policies of the Local Plan. To facilitate this, local planning authorities should set out clearly their strategic policies for the area and ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. Neighbourhood plans should reflect these policies and neighbourhoods should plan positively to support them. Neighbourhood plans and orders should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies.”</i></p> <p>The adopted Local Plan for the area identifies: <i>“A continuing supply of housing land is needed to help meet the changing demographic and social needs of the area, and to help reduce the need to travel and promote economic growth and social inclusion.”</i></p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan should reflect this strategic approach. My view is that, through the Neighbourhood Plan process to date, there has been no clear evidence of needs identified to inform decisions, particularly housing. Without this, residents are unable to respond informatively, and the Neighbourhood Plan cannot fulfil its main function of meeting local needs. Failing to provide residents with information on housing needs, particularly affordable, will ultimately have resulted in less support for development. Consequently, I consider the responses to the Stage 2 Survey do not provide an informed set of opinions that should be relied upon to advise the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Within the proposed Neighbourhood Plan Vision, the delivery of new development is included in the paragraph that is focused on issues that detract from residents’ quality of life. This is a presumption and does not therefore project benefits that future development can bring, particularly in terms of social and economic sustainability. The NPPF seeks to <i>‘significantly boost the supply of housing’</i> and this is supported by identification of the need for a continuing supply of housing to meet local needs,</p>	
--	--	--	------------------------------	--	--

			<p>Policy H&P2 Housing Numbers and Size</p>	<p>included within the adopted Local Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan does not comply with this approach and should not portray such a resistant approach.</p> <p>I believe this policy is flawed, as it fails to reflect the needs of the village. It has not been constructed on the basis of any analysis of needs, but rather the responses to the Stage Two survey, which, as explained above, I consider did not provide informed responses. The Neighbourhood Plan does not present any information about the village's needs, and there have been no published supporting documents considering the issue. A Village Housing Needs Survey was undertaken, but no reference is made to the responses and these have not been formally published. The draft Plan should use the information from the survey results, alongside information readily available from the District Council and other sources, to inform the policy. Evidence based facts should be considered more important than opinion when identifying the needs of the Plan.</p> <p>The justification text states that the Neighbourhood Plan is not an allocation plan, and it should be for the Local Plan to deliver new housing. This fails to grasp the opportunity for the community to decide where new development should take place to meet local needs. The text sets out that because the village has limited public transport and employment opportunities it is effectively an unsustainable location for more than about 20 new homes to be built over the next twenty years. As set out above, this is incorrect interpretation of sustainability. It also makes an out of date assumption that people need to travel to workplaces. Firstly, many households do not work i.e. retired, and many others either</p>	<p>This has been a learning process for all involved. The discussions that have been held proved productive and, if development does not match the expected rate, will be important in considering whether the development boundary should be adjusted. You mention housing needs. We did conduct a Housing Needs Survey but the results were inconclusive, although they did highlight the need for smaller homes in the plan area. We have amended the draft plan and the consultation statement to highlight the results. We did review the wider Weymouth housing needs, in particular with reference to Preston, but it was decided that it would be misleading to offer an assessment, given the difficulty in quantifying the actual need within the plan area.</p> <p>The Steering Group did discuss the feasibility of building 20 new homes within the defined development boundary (DDB). The conclusion was that this was going to be difficult, but not impossible. Although the Stage 2 Survey had shown that the majority opinion in the village was against a change in the boundary, it was decided that the rate of development within the DDB should be monitored with a view to recommending changes, should the number of new homes</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>work from home, or have the ability for flexible working, so that they do not have to visit workplaces on a regular basis. Additionally, it assumes that facilities and services can only be accessed by residents travelling. Again, our world has changed, so that these are now regularly available either on-line, or are delivered e.g. food shopping.</p> <p>The draft Plan puts forward that approximately 20 homes can be built within the existing Village boundary. It is understood that there has been an assessment of where these could be delivered, but this has not been made public to show that the proposed development sites are either available, achievable or appropriate. The character of the village is such that there is no obvious brownfield land capable of redevelopment, so opportunities can only exist through using garden space, or by knocking down dwellings to make way for more. Both of these have significant drawbacks, as the former can lead to cramming of development and the latter would not make commercial sense. If this is to be the strategy there needs to be evidence presented publicly that it is achievable.</p> <p>The District Council has prepared a Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). This identifies land that has been put forward by landowners as available for development and assesses whether they have potential to deliver housing or employment. The locations put forward in and around the Village are publicly available on the Council's website https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/planning-buildings-land/planning-policy/west-dorset-and-weymouth-portland/local-plan-review/evidence/strategic-housing-and-economic-land-availability-assessment.aspx. This shows very few locations within the Village where landowners have put forward their land for development, certainly not enough to deliver 20 dwellings. The Neighbourhood Plan needs to show that the new dwellings it believes are required have a realistic prospect of being delivered</p>	<p>fall below the anticipated rate. It should be noted, however, that three new dwellings are likely to be built within the village this year (FY18/19), on top of four new dwellings completed in FY 17/18.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Affordable Housing

before dismissing the prospect of extending the Village boundary. It should be noted that the SHELAA identifies a series of locations on the edge of the village which it considers have potential for development.

One of the most important issues that the Neighbourhood Plan should consider is the provision of affordable housing. It is very important that Village residents are not forced out of their community because of an inability to access appropriate homes. Sutton Poyntz is a very attractive, desirable village, and this results in very high house prices. The Zoopla website identifies average house prices for the Village at £482,000. This is good news for those residents well-housed, but for those who wish to live in their community, particularly the young, there is no reasonable prospect of finding somewhere to live.

Figures obtained from the District Council show that there are 1,669 households on the Weymouth and Portland housing register. The Council does not have detailed figures for Sutton Poyntz, as it is included within the wider Preston Ward. However, the following table sets out the numbers on the register seeking accommodation in the ward. It is reasonable to assume that some of these have close connections with Sutton Poyntz and would wish to live in the Village.

Row Labels	Ineligible	Bronze	Silver	Gold	Grand Total
Single person requiring studios or 1 bedroom	5	13	19	1	38
Couple requiring studios or 1	4	7	1	1	13

The plan acknowledges rural exception sites (page 25 H&P introduction paragraph 4) and the plan is not against affordable housing. Sites have not been allocated, but the plan does not seek to restrict such allocations. H&P 2 states that the Plan will support smaller 2 or 3 bedroom homes.

			Conclusion	bedroom						
				Family requiring 2 bedrooms	6	1	13		20	
				Family requiring 3 bedrooms		1	5	1	7	
				Family requiring 4 bedrooms			1		1	
				Grand Total	15	22	39	3	79	
				<p>These figures only represent those currently on the register, so do not identify the future needs, which are particularly likely to include the elderly who need to move to specially adapted accommodation, and the young seeking to leave home. The community should aim to provide for these needs and the Neighbourhood Plan should therefore be more positive in its approach to delivering new homes.</p> <p>I do not consider the draft Neighbourhood Plan provides a sound basis to deliver the needs of Sutton Poyntz over the next twenty years. It is a preservationist plan, in that it seeks to avoid change. There is no clear evidence to identify local housing needs, particularly affordable, and as a result, an arbitrary housing target has been chosen. Additionally, there is no clear evidence that the strategy of delivering this housing within the village boundary has a reasonable prospect of success. I therefore request that a Housing Paper is produced to deal with these matters. This should then provide the necessary information to enable an informed debate in the village as to what is actually required and how it can be delivered. This can then be used to prepare a sound Neighbourhood Plan.</p>						
				Once again, thank you for your comments.						

					We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents
26	23/12/2018	Resident	Policy: 1.7	I agree that the Town Council should be pressed to assist forming a locally-based organisation, or recognising an existing organisation to monitor the implementation of the Plan, but this should include maybe one or two elected representatives from the Town Council. Fully support this very important policy to protect the natural environment which is so important in Sutton Poyntz.	Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group. We have revised the proposals about the future monitoring role following discussions with the shadow Weymouth Town Clerk.
			Policy BNE1	I do not think that clause c) is strong enough. Any structures should be temporary and limited to the current use of the site only.	We have reviewed policies BNE1, BNE2 and BNE3 and made changes where relevant.
			Policy BNE2	I fully support the list of proposed designated green spaces.	
			Policy BNE3	Glad this is in there, hopefully the new planning authority will ensure this is accurately implemented when determining applications	
			Policy GA1.3	I do not think it is practical or appropriate to provide segregated space.	We have also made changes to policies GA1 following feedback from the Local Authority.
			Policy GA1.4	I am unclear where access links are necessary, it is easy to walk to services already.	
				I wonder if there is some mileage in including an aspiration or	We have included this as an aspiration.

				<p>action point to encourage community-led transport projects?</p> <p>Policy GA2.3 A potential car park could be hard-surfaced - essential that it does not compromise biodiversity, the policy should be expanded in this respect. Installation of infrastructure which creates a break in hedges, or margins could be very detrimental.</p> <p>Policy GA3.1 Sorry I do not agree. Do not restrict yourselves on what little CIL you receive, as you might want it for something else. Also, going back to monitoring, you need to ensure that any CIL monies are only spent in SP and decided within the local group as to how it is spent.</p> <p>Not a fan of traffic calming measures, we have a 'natural' set of calming measures in the shape of the narrow access into the village due to parked cars on Sutton Road, and the narrow roads/lanes around the pond and up the hill.</p> <p>Policy GA4, HE1, HE2 Support</p> <p>Policy H&P1 The only bit I don't like is the last paragraph which implies that you would want traditional styles in these other areas whereas some very contemporary designs, using natural materials can be very effective. Maybe a re-wording would help.</p> <p>Policy H&P2 Support in general</p> <p>Policy H&P3 Support the list of views, however I do feel that we may face applications for exception sites outside the DDB and there are views I would like to see protected through the design of new development here. I am thinking of, of course, Puddings Field, the end of Sutton Close and Old Bincombe Lane, and looking north</p>	
					We have revised the wording in policy H&P1 to be more flexible and less prescriptive.

			<p>from Puddledock, there may be others. Is it worth adding something to protect these open areas from high, over bulky, or imposing designs?</p> <p>Policy H&P4 Support, although think that is already provided for in the Local Plan and NPPF</p> <p>Policy SR1 Support in general, though note that if for example you wanted to expand the Mission Hall you cannot as the orchard you are protecting, so both policies would have to be addressed should there ever be any proposals.</p> <p>Policy SR2 I am sorry I really don't like this policy. There was very minimal support for a play area, with some respondents pointing out that there are several within walking distance. My problem with this policy is that it is restrictive to a play area - why? You might want other things, such as a community orchard, allotments, a multi-purpose sports field etc. I would not restrict it to a play area.</p> <p>Would be good, though ambitious, to include maybe forming a group to take these things forward.</p>	<p>The proposal for a children's play area (policy SR2) reflects longstanding support within the community, as recorded in previous village reports and identified (again) in the Stage 2 Survey. There may well be operational issues to be resolved, but the first step should be to agree the need and develop a suitable policy.</p> <p>This will form part of the discussions with Weymouth Town Council on monitoring of the implementation of the Plan.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at:</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents
27	24/12/2018	Richard Dodson MA, IEng, FIHE, MRTPI, DipMgt. Planning Obligations Manager Dorset County Council Tel: 01305 228583 r.c.dodson@dorsetcc.gov.uk	H&P 4	Thank you for consulting DCC on the Reg 14 Version of your plan. As usual I consulted various colleagues here and am pleased to advise that I only received one observation / suggestion you may wish to consider. Policy H&P 4 indicates how new developments are expected to address flood and drainage mitigation. DCC Flood Risk Team has produced some standing advice relating to such issues (attached). It appears that H&P4 is in general conformity with this advice, but you may wish to consider whether direct inclusion or reference to it would provide the plan greater protection. Hope this helps	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>Direct reference has been made to this advice within the revised plan.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
28	24/12/2018	Resident		The introduction of neighbourhood plans through the Localism Act introduced the opportunity for local people to have a degree of control on how their communities should be planned. My understanding of this process is that it should therefore be an inclusive and positive process that works for everyone within the context of broader strategic planning of the local planning authority. It should therefore seek to meet the needs of the local community while looking to protect that which is important. Unfortunately, my experience of the process in Sutton Poyntz has been one that has been exclusive, operating for a small few, without adequate engagement and involvement of the wider community. The neighbourhood plan group has failed to involve landowners, from the outset, and has made various proposals at different stages based on personal views rather than in some cases fully supported evidence. If the plan is to be truly representative	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>The Consultation Statement accompanying the draft plan details the extensive and continuing consultation carried out with all stakeholders. We have endeavoured to improve our communication efforts, based on the feedback received, but all meetings have been open (attended by landowners and other stakeholders) and the minutes of meetings readily available. We have also organised additional open public meetings. It</p>

				<p>and supportive then it needs to be framed positively and have the support of the community. There remain many unresolved issues and disgruntled owners who wonder who the plan is for.</p>	<p>is misleading to say that there has been a lack of communication or a failure to provide adequate information throughout the year. Moreover, all questions raised by stakeholders have received individual responses. This is not to say that at times there hasn't been scope for improvement, but we have energetically addressed (and resolved) any areas where problems have been brought to the Steering Group's attention.</p> <p>With regard to the support of the community, the Stage 1 and Stage 2 Surveys have provided strong evidence. Ultimately, of course, this can only be tested through a public referendum.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
29	24/11/2018	Resident		<p>In December 2017, we received the Stage two survey of the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan (SPNP) and this was the first time we realised that our land, known to us as "Herbie's garden" had been included in the Neighbourhood plan proposal to be designated as "green space".</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p>

			<p>Question 4 of the SPNP stage two survey refers to our garden as G9 “Puddledock Allotments”. This is because we had extended our good will to 4 gardeners when we purchased the land and continued to allow the use of 4 plots of our garden by way of an annual agreement. However, those agreements have now been discontinued in order to prevent any further misunderstanding about our private land. This dispute with the NP Group has also prompted us to install a lock on our gate and a sign to inform everyone that our garden is private. (The ‘Herbies garden’ name plate has been in place for at least 5 years and is in honour of our dear friend, Herbie Morris who lived at No 3 Puddledock Cottages and presided over the land for 50 years until he passed away).</p> <p>As a result of the Stage two survey, we attended the next Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Group open meeting along with three other landowners who were incensed at the inclusion of their land and property in the survey document and the lack of direct communication or discussion whatsoever with any of us.</p> <p>I have attended most of the meetings this past year and have submitted letters reassuring the group that “Herbies garden” is our private garden and should not be included in the Neighbourhood Plan as green space. Just as every other resident of Sutton Poyntz with private gardens, are not included in the green space designation.</p> <p>We have told the NP group that since we purchased the land in 2012, we have already improved and enhanced our garden and we intend to continue to take great care of this land. We have also reassured the group that we have no intention to seek development on our land.</p> <p>As the NP Group know already there exists enough protection on our land. It is in a conservation area, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and Local Plan Open Gap as well as being a flood plain. So, there could never be any development on this</p>	<p>Regarding ‘Puddledock Allotments’, this name has been commonly used by villagers to identify the area concerned. We acknowledge that a number of local residents have held ‘growing plots’ on this land both during present and previous ownership. You will note that we have labelled G9 as “Puddledock Allotments (Herbies Garden)” in the table of proposed Local Green Spaces (LGS) - to assist clear identification by all stakeholders.</p> <p>As you know, several landowners directly affected by the potential LGS designation have attended Steering Group meetings to express their concerns .</p> <p>Private gardens can be included in the LGS designation (although ‘Herbies garden’, while private land, is not a private garden since it does not form the curtilage of a residence). It is the Steering Group’s view, supported by an independent assessment, that the additional protection offered to your land by LGS designation is important. – strengthening the existing protections and extending them to wildlife, recreation and historic aspects.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>Section 3.2 Summary Objectives</p> <p>land anyway.</p> <p>Objective 6 “Retain and enhance important green spaces found in and around the village.” Action: This objective should be clarified by a footnote, which explains that local green space designation does not include any legal powers to control the management of private land. As stated within government guidelines (Open space, sports and recreation facilities, public rights of way and local green space, paragraph 21 (1))</p> <p>Section 4.1 Biodiversity and The Natural Environment</p> <p>This section includes the following statement: “The designation of areas of green space that shall be protected from development and destruction of habitat.” The destruction of habitat with regard to local green spaces cannot be guaranteed or prevented, as management of local green spaces cannot be prescribed for private land (Open space, sports and recreation facilities, public rights of way and local green space, paragraph 21 (2)). Therefore, Action: The Phrase “destruction of habitat” should be removed from the plan. For all these reasons I strongly suggest that it is unnecessary to insist on making our land “Green Space”, there would be no benefit over and above our own management and guardianship which we foresee will continue for at least the life of the Neighbourhood Plan of 18 years, and beyond. I note that in the Introduction of The Sutton Poyntz Place Appraisal, one of the key themes includes “Better communication and cooperate with landowners” under the heading Land Use and Conservation.</p> <p>I would like to point out that the group did not consult, communicate or cooperate adequately with us as landowners</p>	<p>We don’t believe it is appropriate to add a footnote to the summary of the village vision and objectives.</p> <p>Regarding section 4.1, while we recognise the provisions under paragraph 21(2), this does not support the destruction of habitat which would potentially be in contravention of other legal provisions, such as those under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 or The Hedgerow Regulation 1997. Removal of this statement from the introductory overview would not add positively to the overall biodiversity objectives, however an amendment has been included to refer to “... potential destruction of habitat”</p> <p>The Consultation Statement accompanying the draft plan details the extensive and</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Lack of planned development for Sutton Poyntz</p>	<p>during the whole of this process to produce the Neighbourhood Plan. This is not just “bad manners” as was reported in the minutes after the first meeting we attended, that description is insulting and is one of the reasons why we feel disrespected and have no confidence in the NP Group.</p> <p>This lack of communication and inadequate information to property owners continued throughout the year despite explicitly expressing this complaint to the Steering group back at the beginning of the year. (Please see accompanying letter signed by all of the home owners at Puddledock Cottages regarding our houses being included on the heritage asset list.)</p> <p>It is noticeable that the purpose and objective of a neighbourhood plan is to create a strategy for development in local communities; “shape the development and growth of their local area” (3). The plan appears to be focused on making development more difficult. The plan commits to only 20 new houses and does not give a justifying feasibility assessment or delivery plan to achieve this target. At a time when there is a national housing crisis it would appear that Sutton Poyntz are presenting as many obstacles as possible to any development.</p> <p>The place appraisal particularly discusses the need to “focus on smaller houses both for younger families and for downsizing” but the H&P2 emphasizes the downsizing rather than the encouragement of housing for younger people and families.</p>	<p>continuing consultation carried out with all stakeholders. We have endeavoured to improve our communication efforts, based on the feedback received, but all meetings have been open (attended by landowners and other stakeholders) and the minutes of meetings readily available. Moreover, all questions raised by stakeholders have received individual responses. We have also organised additional open public meetings and met with you in person to discuss your concerns. It is therefore misleading to say that there has been a lack of communication or a failure to provide adequate information throughout the year. This is not to say that there have not been opportunities for improvement, but we have addressed (and resolved) such issues whenever and wherever they have occurred.</p> <p>Reference policy H&P2, the Steering Group did discuss the feasibility of building 20 new homes within the Defined Development Boundary (DDB). The conclusion reached was that this was going to be difficult, but not impossible. Although the Stage 2 Survey had shown that the majority opinion in the village was against a change in the DDB, it was decided that the rate of growth should be monitored with a view to recommending changes, should the number of new homes fall below the anticipated rate. It should be noted, however, that three new dwellings</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Improving quality of life and community spirit</p> <p>Section 1.7: Management and Monitoring</p>	<p>I note that in the draft Neighbourhood plan Section 3.1 and in The Place Appraisal the shared vision seeks to <i>“Improve the quality of life for residents. Support a thriving and friendly community”</i></p> <p>I suggest that the process of producing this neighbourhood plan has resulted in a less friendly community and proven to be destructive rather than improving the quality of life here in Sutton Poyntz.</p> <p>The plan does not give a clear understanding of what the monitoring and management would entail. Each policy should include an explanation of how it will be monitored in order for the village to consult on this aspect.</p> <p>The Steering Group’s proposal of the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group members or the Sutton Poyntz Society, fulfilling the monitoring role involve a minority of un-elected village members “policing” / “monitoring” the majority. The use of the term democratic mandate is incorrect, democratic mandate is the authority granted by a constituency to act as its representative. Although the neighbourhood plan may have been ratified by the village, the village will not have voted on the principle of the Sutton Poyntz Society acting as its representative. Action: Delete the phrase “democratic mandate”.</p> <p>I strongly believe that the management and monitoring of the neighbourhood plan should be left to the new unitary authority. This should be left to the professional town planners within the council and not the unqualified and self-appointed members of the village acting in a “policing” manor and causing stress and distress to residents, as apparently has happened in the past.</p>	<p>are likely to be built within the village this year (FY18/19), on top of four new dwellings completed in FY 17/18.</p> <p>The plan acknowledges rural exception sites (page25 H&P introduction paragraph 4) and is certainly not opposed to affordable housing. Sites have not been allocated in the plan, but it does not seek to restrict such allocations.</p> <p>We have initiated discussions on a future monitoring strategy with the shadow Weymouth Town Clerk. We have revised section 1.7 with a view to a monitoring arrangement similar to that implemented by Alton Parish Council https://www.adra.community/residents-associations/alton-neighbourhood-plan-monitoring-group Although it would be ideal to be able to include specific metrics within each policy, this has not proved possible. However, the ‘Summary of Intent’ section provides an adequate basis for the effective monitoring of each individual policy.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p><u>References</u></p> <p>1 https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space#Local-Green-Space-designation</p> <p>2 https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space#Local-Green-Space-designation</p> <p>3 https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning-2</p>	<p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
30	24/12/2018	Residents	<p>In December 2017, the Stage 2 survey questionnaire of the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan was delivered to householders in Sutton Poyntz and this was the first communication we had that such a Plan existed. We were not consulted prior to this. Question 13 of the survey proposed a list of locally important Heritage Assets, but Puddledock Cottages was not included on the list. At the next neighbourhood plan meeting homeowners strongly objected to there being a divisive list in the survey document requesting the steering committee to disregard the survey results for the list. We only became aware that our cottages might be affected by the heritage asset list in September 2018. A note was posted by hand to inform us that a consultant would be visiting the next day to view property's in the village in order to produce a heritage asset report. We were not invited to be present for the walk around. The report was emailed to some (but not all) on 7th September and we had until the meeting on 25th September to respond. The minutes of that meeting read that a meeting had been "provisionally booked" for the consultant to meet with homeowners if they wished further discussion, but we were not given the date.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>As you are aware, the Stage 2 Survey indicated a general concern that, although we live in a conservation area, there was very little information available about what was important (in heritage terms) to the community. The local heritage report was generated (in response to this need) by a suitably qualified and experienced architect. She worked independently but we copied the subsequent draft report to all stakeholders for their comment. We corrected any errors and omissions that were notified (including any issues raised at the subsequent public meeting where the consultant was questioned on the methodology and criteria employed and the potential impact on householders) before her final report was issued.</p>	

			<p>On Monday 1st October we had a hand delivered note to inform us that the consultant would meet with us at 11.30 am on Thursday 4th October, which did not give adequate time for all people to arrange to attend that meeting.</p> <p>It was not possible during that month to get all of the Puddledock Cottages homeowners together to put forward our combined response to the steering group. We were not given adequate information of how this heritage list would affect our lives or our property in the future.</p> <p>We wish to say that the way in which the steering committee have conducted the communication with us as stakeholders has been inadequate and less than inclusive. People who live at a distance or without the internet have been particularly disadvantaged.</p> <p>It was raised at the first meeting back at the beginning of the year that property owners should have been approached from the outset and yet the same mistakes have been repeated over again throughout the year.</p> <p>We now welcome the opportunity to raise our objections formally and request amendment to the heritage asset report.</p> <p>As owners of the terrace of all four Puddledock Cottages, we request that our properties should be removed from the list, because all our cottages have undergone extensive alterations/re-builds and are no longer as they were originally.</p> <p>The workings and rebuilding are as follows: -</p> <p>The slate roofs have been renovated to include felt / batons and the slates have been replaced. Some of the finials, hips and ridge tiles are missing or have been changed from the originals. The chimneys have had to be rebuilt to make them safe.</p> <p>All the windows at the front and back of all 4 cottages which were originally metal on wood and glazed with agricultural glass, have been replaced with new double-glazed windows.</p> <p>The front of the cottages has been repointed although not with the</p>	<p>The creation of a local heritage listing has been included in the draft plan as a community aspiration rather than a policy. If the Local Authority decides to create a local heritage list, we will forward the consultant's report, together with all the correspondence received, for their information.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
--	--	--	---	---

				<p>original lime mortar.</p> <p>The front door of No 3 has been replaced and is not the original.</p> <p>The stone wall at the front of and belonging to No's 2 and 3 has been demolished and completely rebuilt. {photographic evidence will be supplied}</p> <p>There are extensive alterations at the backs of the cottages. There are considerable extensions to No 1, 2 and 4 and the communal bake house and bread oven between No 2 and 3, is now a bathroom. The back doors have also been relocated.</p> <p>The street lamp outside No 2 and the steel hooped-top railings between 1 and 2 have been made and fitted in the last 20 years.</p>	
31	24/11/2018	Resident/Stakeholder	Policy: H&P	<p>I find it troubling that there is no mention of housing need and affordable housing for local people. There was a housing needs survey and there is information available on housing needs in the locality. No mention of these in the plan. At least one landowner has offered land as a low cost/shared equity site but there is no mention of this in the plan.</p> <p>The housing policies are too restrictive, and the village is full so the objective of building 20 houses within the existing defined development boundary is unrealistic and defined to obstruct development.</p> <p>I am aware that consideration was given as to where 20 houses could be built and this information should be included in the published paperwork, particularly as the conclusion was that without demolition of many properties 20 new dwellings were highly improbable.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>The SG did discuss the feasibility of building 20 new homes within the defined development boundary (DDB). The conclusion was that this was going to be difficult, but not impossible. Although the Stage 2 Survey had shown that the majority opinion in the village was against a change in the boundary, it was decided that the rate of growth should be monitored with a view to recommending changes in the DDB, should the number of new homes fall below the anticipated rate. It should be noted, however, that three new dwellings are likely to be built within the village this year (FY18/19), on top of four new dwellings</p>

			<p>Policy: HE 2</p>	<p>This proposes a list of heritage assets which has not been well received by many of those whose homes are on the draft lists. I am pleased that the draft list has not been included in the plan. The number of proposed properties on the draft list was disproportionate for a village of this size and this seems to be an unnecessary process. The village does not have many houses of architectural or historical note and those that are of this quality are already listed. Introducing a new list is unhelpful. It has caused a great deal of unhappiness among those whose houses are on the draft list.</p>	<p>completed in FY 17/18. The plan acknowledges rural exception sites (page 25 H&P introduction paragraph 4) and is not against affordable housing. Sites have not been allocated in the plan, but it does not seek to restrict such allocations.</p> <p>As you are aware, the Stage 2 Survey indicated a general concern that, although we live in a conservation area, there was very little information available about what was important (in heritage terms) to the community. The local heritage report was generated (in response to this need) by a suitably qualified and experienced architect. She worked independently but we copied the subsequent draft report to all stakeholders for their comment. We corrected any errors and omissions that were notified (including any issues raised at the subsequent public meeting where the consultant was questioned on the methodology and criteria employed and the potential impact on householders) before her final report was issued.</p> <p>The creation of a local heritage listing has been included in the draft plan as a community aspiration rather than a policy. If the Local Authority decides to create a local heritage list, we will forward the consultant's report, together with all the correspondence received, for their information.</p>
--	--	--	---------------------	---	---

			<p>Policy: BNE 2</p> <p>Designation of private land as green spaces without overwhelming evidence that it is a valid option is divisive. In particular I object to the allotments being designated, not least because this action has led to the tenants being given notice to leave and so has been counterproductive.</p> <p>Other comments:</p> <p>Sutton Poyntz is part of Weymouth and Portland, according to a recent report by Dorset Community Foundation (https://www.dorsetcommunityfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/FINAL-Hidden_Dorset_2_prf5_06.09.18-1.pdf) there is significant poverty and need in the town, the report states:</p> <p>Weymouth and Portland have key maritime connections, a well-established tourism and service industry, a beach rated amongst the best in the UK & Europe and was chosen to host watersport and sailing events at the 2012 Olympics. This outward success is in conflict with the living experience of residents suffering from severe and multiple deprivation. Weymouth & Portland is the third worst of 324 local authorities in England for social mobility and has the next most areas in the top 20% for Income and Employment deprivation in Dorset, after Bournemouth. It also has the highest proportion of children living in low income families in the county at 20%. It is perhaps no wonder that Weymouth has the busiest foodbank in Dorset, feeding over 2,500 people each year. I find it troubling that a plan for the wealthiest suburb of Weymouth makes no provision for those in need in the town and appears to be seeking to exempt itself from providing for those less fortunate.</p>	<p>Much thought was given to the potential areas for Local Green Space designation and an independent professional assessment was undertaken (ref 37) which resulted in one area being added to the proposed list and four areas being removed.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
32	24/11/2018	Resident	<p>Section 4.5</p> <p>Pleased that the Defined Development boundary is stated and will be endorsed to preserve the rural aspect of the village. (POLICY H&P2)</p> <p>Section 4.5</p> <p>“The possibility of small-scale exceptions is noted, as long as they</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>Regarding exception sites, we have received</p>

			<p>match the requirements of Local Plan (14) policy HOUS2 (on rural exception sites), subject to sustainability.”</p> <p>This statement appears to undermine the enforcement of the defined development boundary that was supported by the majority of those who took part in the village consultation process. The views of the local people need to be fully reflected in this plan. Therefore, can this statement be removed? The requirements of the Local Plan (14) can still be fulfilled by the borough as there is enough land within the defined development boundary of the borough to meet housing need.</p> <p>Can this section highlight the expressed views and concerns from residents about the desire to protect the defined development boundary as in other sections, e.g. strong support from local consultation (10)</p>	<p>both critical and supportive comments on this paragraph. In the absence of a call for sites, or support for a review of the defined development boundary, this statement is an important indicator of the community’s wish to play its part in meeting local and national housing needs. We have amended the wording, however, to state that an exception site would only be possible if need could be demonstrated.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
33	24/12/2018	Resident	<p>Having read the Draft Sutton Poyntz Plan (6.11.18) we would like to thank those people (in particular the volunteers) that have contributed to the compilation of this very thorough and detailed document.</p> <p>The only serious concern we have is with regard to the paragraph on page 25 section 4.5- Housing and Planning:- “The possibility of small scale exceptions is noted as long as they match the requirements of Local Plan (14) policy HOUS 2 (on rural exception sites) subject to sustainability”.</p> <p>This does not sit comfortably with the wishes and aspirations expressed in the document. It’s confusing! What does “The possibility of small scale exceptions is noted” mean?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>Regarding exception sites, we have received both critical and supportive comments on this paragraph. In the absence of a call for sites, or support for a review of the defined development boundary, this statement is an important indicator of the community’s wish to play its part in meeting local and national housing needs. We have amended the</p>

				<p>An application to build 12 houses (4 affordable) 2016 off Plaisters Lane was refused and went to appeal. The refusal was upheld by The Planning Inspectorate on a number of grounds, including none sustainability.</p> <p>The above mentioned paragraph should be removed.</p> <p>Apart from that, we are happy.</p>	<p>wording, however, to state that an exception site would only be possible if need could be demonstrated.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
34	25/12/2018	Resident	<p>Sect 4.5 Page 29 Intro</p>	<p>The aim of the Defined Development Boundary is described in too limited terms.</p> <p>The DDB is applicable to the environments of the whole village to protect the values views and landscape. The use of the DDB should be amplified more.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>Reference Section 4.5, the Defined Development Boundary is managed by the Local Authority. The Neighbourhood Plan should not (and cannot) replicate policies that already exist within the Local Plan. For these reasons, we have chosen to focus on those areas where we can develop relevant development policies.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting</p>

				<p>We brought our family up here and years ago when our children were school age I can count nearly 30 families living in the village. Now I suspect there are only a handful who could afford to live here. We have an elderly population and need a bigger cross section of the community. Development is very much discouraged as we saw with the last development plan proposed in Plaisters Lane. Small scale exceptions are acknowledged as a possibility outside the development boundary (rural exception sites) and would enable young families to move here with affordable housing.</p>	<p>seek to restrict such allocations. In this context, we believe that there are at least 40 young people currently living in the village.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
36	30/12/2018 (Dated 17/12/2018)	Stakeholder		<p>Re Inclusion of The Springhead Hotel on the Neighbourhood Plan I write to express my disappointment that The Springhead Hotel is still included in the Neighbourhood plan after previously stating our wish for The Springhead to be excluded.</p> <p>I believe that all/most of the residential properties which you originally listed have now been removed along with the Waterworks following the request from Wessex water for it to be removed. The Waterworks is a museum, education centre and a listed building therefore a very important asset to the community so why has this been removed, and the pub remain listed?</p> <p>We have worked very hard over the years to bring The Springhead into a financially viable state. During the first few years we</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>The Heritage Report was produced by an independent architect with appropriate qualifications and experience. It would be inappropriate to amend her conclusions. However, we will forward your comments, together with the original report, to the Local Authority - should they wish to create a Local Heritage List.</p>

			<p>financially supported the business ourselves until we diversified into the functions side of the industry, which included refurbishment (at our own cost) of the Blue Duck function room. This in turn has now allowed The Springhead to become financially viable. We now employ over 25 local people which is a huge achievement compared to previous landlords.</p> <p>I strongly believe that if The Springhead and The Pavilion (Blue Duck) is included within the plan it will be highly likely, if not certain, that it will bring further financial burden. If we need to further develop this side of the business to meet the ever-increasing demands of the hospitality industry, being on the Heritage Asset list will cause either ourselves or any further tenants, great difficulty in achieving this.</p> <p>Current industry figures show that approx. 18 pubs per week closed in the UK this year, the Southwest sits 3rd in the entire UK for rate of closure. With increasing costs throughout the industry, adding a further potential financial burden (by making it a Heritage Asset) to The Springhead could be catastrophic.</p> <p>As you can see, I am very opposed to The Springhead being included in the Neighbourhood plan as are Punch Taverns, who I am also aware have written to you informing you to exclude The Springhead. I also believe that the Spice ship and the Bridge Inn which are located within 1 km of us have not been included in the Parish of Preston's neighbourhood plan which does not make sense due to their own historical backgrounds and this leaves them with a potential advantage over The Springhead.</p> <p>To conclude, if you do try to include The Springhead Hotel we will appeal immediately to Weymouth and Portland Council as soon as you submit you plan and, if necessary, we will also start a petition</p>	<p>Please be reassured that no buildings were removed from the report 'on request'; some buildings were removed as a result of representations from householders showing that features were not as old or as unchanged as initially appeared. You should also know that the <i>Spice Ship</i> is a Grade II Listed Building, which is a more significant designation. The <i>Sly Fox</i> in Osmington is also listed as a Key Unlisted Building (the equivalent designation) in the Conservation Area Appraisal for Osmington, West Knighton, West Stafford and Owermoigne.</p> <p>We regret that both landowner and licensee are unhappy about the inclusion of the <i>Springhead</i> in the report. However, the creation of a Local Heritage List is a village aspiration rather than a policy. The consultant's report will have no effect on the <i>Springhead's</i> current or future operations.</p> <p>We are very happy to acknowledge the outstanding work that the present team have done since they took over the <i>Springhead</i>. Many responses to the Neighbourhood Plan surveys showed how valued the <i>Springhead</i> is, and how it represents the heart of the village.</p> <p>In turn, we hope that you would be happy to acknowledge community's efforts to support development while maintaining the village</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>with signatures from all those villagers who support The Springhead not being included.</p> <p>I hope that this letter will be received well and can be discussed with a view to removing The Springhead from your list.</p>	<p>as an attractive and welcome destination for residents, tourists and visitors.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
37	05/01/2018	<p>Andrew Cowling, Punch Group Estate Development Manager</p> <p>Tel: 01283 501600 Mob: 07718-092020</p> <p>Jubilee House, Second Avenue, Burton upon Trent, DE14 2WF Andrew.Cowling@punchtaverns.com</p>		<p>I write to formally object to the Springhead Hotel being included in The Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood plan. No other commercial premises in Sutton Poyntz have been included.</p> <p>The inclusion of the Springhead Hotel could have a detrimental effect on the existing tenant and any subsequent tenant due to placing further burdens on them in a market when many village pubs are failing.</p> <p>I am also aware that the Spice Ship and the Bridge Inn Preston are not included in their areas neighbourhood plan and this will give them an unfair advantage over the Springhead Hotel.</p> <p>If one of our assets is included, we believe that it will deter interest in the property and deter any development of the property. We supported the previous Landlord when he made a planning application to develop the property to increase trade which might not be forthcoming in the future if the property was listed.</p> <p>If you go ahead and include one of our assets we will write to Weymouth and Portland Council to have it removed before it is placed on the register.</p> <p>We have done this with other Local Authorities and have also appealed to the First-tier (General Regulatory Chamber).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, in response to the draft Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, which have been carefully considered by the Steering Group.</p> <p>We believe that there is a misunderstanding about the potential impact of local heritage listing on a business and future development. The Neighbourhood Plan itself does not have the power to create a local heritage list.</p> <p>The Heritage Report was produced by an independent architect with appropriate qualifications and experience. It would be inappropriate to interfere with her independent report, which may or may not be used by the Local Authority, when and if they decide to prepare a formal Local List.</p>

		Stakeholder			<p>Preston has no Neighbourhood Plan, and we cannot guess whether the <i>Bridge Inn</i> would be included in a similar list, however, the <i>Spice Ship</i> is already a Grade II Listed Building, which is a much more significant designation. It is also worth noting that the <i>Sly Fox</i> in Osmington is listed as a Key Unlisted Building (the equivalent designation) in the Conservation Area Appraisal for Osmington, West Knighton, West Stafford and Owermoigne.</p> <p>You suggest that “no other commercial premises ... have been included”. There are only two significant commercial premises in the village, the <i>Springhead</i> and the <i>Cartshed</i>, and both are included.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have now submitted the draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Authority. This document, together with the supporting evidence (including a summary of all the Regulation 14 responses) can be found on the village website at: http://suttonpoyntz.org.uk/index.php/neighbourhood/documents</p>
--	--	-------------	--	--	---